

International Meeting: Plenary Session I

For the Swift Abolition of Nuclear Weapons **(August 3)**

Panel One: Government Representatives:

Mohd Arshad Manzoor Hussain Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the UN in Vienna Malaysia

Mr. Chairman, Excellencies,
Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Please allow me at the outset, to express my sincere appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman and the Organising Committee of the 2007 World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs for inviting me to address this important gathering, in this famous city, which, due to its painful history, is now a symbolic *cause celebre* of the movement against nuclear weapons. This event, this city as well as the city of Nagasaki should remind humankind of the folly of warfare, more so of nuclear war which, God forbid, should never happen again. Today, I believe, there are many in the audience who are victims or children of victims of that tragic day. We must not let you down. We must be relentless in our pursuit of the noble objective of seeking the abolishment of nuclear weapons.

Let me take this opportunity to pay tribute to all the individuals, civil society and NGOs for their tireless effort in once again organizing and hosting this important conference. It is my fervent hope that this conference would continue to provide avenues for representatives of governments and NGOs to further strengthen their global solidarity beyond boundaries in our common endeavour to see the total and complete elimination of nuclear weapons from this world. This conference is also important because it gives us the opportunity to pay tribute to the victims of atomic bombs who perished or suffered that tragic event 62 years ago. It serves as a stark reminder for all of us to redouble our efforts and renew our determination to strive for the abolition of nuclear weapons. We cannot remain idle until this noble objective is achieved for the sake of peace, security and survival of mankind.

I am deeply honoured and privileged to be able to share with all present here today Malaysia's views and vision on how we approach the issue of

nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. In this regard, I would like to express Malaysia's fullest support for the message embodied in the theme of this conference, "A Nuclear Weapon-Free, Peaceful and Just World", which Malaysia believes to be an achievable ideal.

Despite the end of the cold war, we are still today confronted with the threat of self extinction arising from the existence of nuclear weapons. The accumulation of weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, constitute a threat to the future of the human race. Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons are more than enough to annihilate the entire population of the world. The prolonged existence of nuclear weapons continue to pose threats to international peace and security. This is why Malaysia strongly believes that the most effective guarantee against the danger of nuclear war and the use of nuclear weapons is the complete elimination of such weapons. Malaysia has always and will continue to regard the issue of disarmament and non-proliferation based on a principled approach. Malaysia has long supported and is committed to the attainment of general and complete nuclear disarmament. This is based on the conviction that the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons represents the gravest of dangers to humankind as a whole, which must be urgently addressed by the world community.

In this regard, Malaysia views the collective and collaborative involvement by governments, private sector interests, civil society and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in joint efforts aimed at addressing the twin issues of disarmament and non-proliferation, particularly of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs), as a positive step in the right direction. My presence here today is testament to the importance that Malaysia attaches towards achieving complete and general nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation as well as an expression of our support and appreciation for the important role played by Civil Society and NGOs.

Malaysia continues to hold the view, despite all the criticisms leveled against it, that the Treaty on the Non- Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) remains an indispensable cornerstone of the

international regime which was established to stem the spread of nuclear weapons. In this regard also, I wish to remind that the NPT was the first international treaty that unequivocally considered weapons proliferation, particularly nuclear weapons, as a threat to international peace and security.

I would also like to take this opportunity to remind everyone of the historic and important "Advisory Opinion on the Threat and Legality of Use of Nuclear Weapons" which was issued by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on 8 July 1996. Among others, the Advisory Opinion affirmed several key arguments against the threat and use of nuclear weapons, as follows:

- that the threat and use of nuclear weapons are subject to the laws of war;
- that such threat and use are generally prohibited under international law;
- that nuclear deterrence cannot be said to be sanctioned by law; and
- that there exists an obligation, particularly on the Nuclear Weapons States (NWS), 'to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control'.

In this regard, I wish to inform that Malaysia co-sponsored a working paper entitled "Model Nuclear Weapons Convention" submitted by Costa Rica during the last NPT Preparatory Committee in May 2007. The model convention was submitted to assist States parties to the NPT in their deliberations with respect to the implementation of Article VI of the NPT. It explores the legal, technical and political elements required for the achievement and maintenance of a nuclear-weapon-free world. In this respect it goes beyond the obligations of States parties to the NPT to also address disarmament obligations of all States under customary international law as affirmed by the International Court of Justice in its 1996 Advisory Opinion on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

Malaysia remains convinced that the continued existence of nuclear weapons poses the greatest danger to humankind and the greatest threat to human civilizations. Today, more so than ever before, we are deeply concerned about the inherent danger of a thermonuclear war triggered by accident or through terror attacks. Until these weapons of mass destruction are drastically reduced and ultimately eliminated, humankind cannot afford to ease its vigilance.

We are convinced that total disarmament, especially, nuclear disarmament is essential for the prevention of war and the promotion of peace and security in the world and the best guarantee against nuclear holocaust. In this regard, whilst we commend some nuclear weapons States for taking either bilateral or unilateral actions to reduce their

nuclear stockpiles, the remaining arsenals, which continue to be deployed and ready to be used, are still substantial and pose a big threat to the human race.

In this regard, Malaysia reiterates its call for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps agreed to at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, including the unequivocal undertaking given by the nuclear weapon States for the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. Malaysia hopes that the next Review Conference of the NPT in 2010 will not receive the same fate as the last one in May 2005 when it failed to achieve significant results due to a lack of political will, inflexibility and selective approach by some State parties.

Therefore, it is crucial that favourable conditions be created for the further advancement of the global disarmament process. Malaysia is concerned with the increasing resort to unilateralism and unilaterally imposed prescriptions, as well as with strategic defense doctrines that set out new rationale for the use of nuclear weapons, including elements aimed at possible use and the threat of use of nuclear weapons. While we recognize the importance and continued relevance of bilateral negotiations and unilateral decisions, it should not detract from the importance of multilateral negotiations. Indeed, the two tracks could complement and reinforce each other; nuclear disarmament is a matter of concern to all humanity, not just to the nuclear weapon States.

We also urge all States to strictly abide by the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Any action that ignores these provisions and that is incompatible with the principles of international laws would adversely affect genuine and serious efforts in the field of disarmament. In this context, we underscore the vital importance of multilateralism and multilaterally agreed solutions as they provide the only sustainable method in addressing disarmament and international security issues.

The nuclear weapon states have a particular responsibility to respond appropriately to this development. They must demonstrate in a convincing way their strong and continued commitment to the goals of nuclear disarmament, as embodied in the NPT, by embarking on serious negotiations towards the reduction of their nuclear arsenals leading to their ultimate elimination.

We, therefore, remain fully convinced that the NPT is a key instrument in the efforts to halt the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. It also provides the essential foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament. The NPT seeks to ensure a fair balance between the mutual obligations and responsibilities of nuclear weapon States and that of the non- nuclear weapon States. However, we observe that the

lack of balance in the implementation of the NPT has threatened to unravel the NPT regime.

Indefinite extension of the NPT does not imply the indefinite possession of nuclear arsenals by the nuclear weapon States. In fact, some States still believe in the relevance of nuclear weapons and continue to develop and modernize their nuclear arsenals. What qualifies these countries for possession of the means of mass destruction in perpetuity? We must all call for an end to this and seek the elimination and ban on all forms of nuclear weapons and testing as well as the rejection of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence. We must also emphasize the importance of the full and non-selective implementation of the three pillars of the NPT, namely disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear technology. Besides, pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, efforts for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurance to non-nuclear weapon States should be pursued as a matter of priority.

Malaysia also firmly believes that all issues or conflicts, including those revolving around disarmament and non-proliferation, should be addressed through peaceful negotiations with a view to achieving mutually acceptable outcome to issues of contention, among the parties concerned. In this regard, Malaysia is pleased to note the progress achieved thus far with regard to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's nuclear issue and the eventual shut down and sealing for the purpose of eventual abandonment of the Yongbyon nuclear facility, including the reprocessing facility. I wish to express Malaysia's desire for the total realization of the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and our continued support of the Six-Party Talks, as a way to find a long term solution to the Korean nuclear issue through diplomacy and dialogue.

We also believe that the universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) by all countries would contribute towards the process of nuclear disarmament and the enhancement of international peace and security. In this regard, the five nuclear weapons States are expected to provide the leadership in making the ban on the test a reality. Although they maintain their voluntary moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosion, this in no way constitutes a substitute for the signing, ratification and entry into force of the CTBT. Early ratification by nuclear weapon States would not only have the desired impact on the progress towards entry into force of the CTBT, but also pave the way and encourage the remaining countries listed in Annex 2 to the CTBT to sign and ratify the Treaty.

In the meantime, we also welcome efforts aimed at establishing new nuclear weapons-free zones in all regions where they do not exist. We

firmly believe that the establishment of nuclear-weapons-free zones is an effective measure of geographical limitation of nuclear proliferation, and contributes to the twin goals of non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. It further contributes towards strengthening the security of the States in the zones and enhancing peace and security in a collective manner.

The problem that we face today is not the lack of ideas. It is the lack of political will on the part of the nuclear weapon states to move the process forward. Indeed, international peace and security cannot be fully maintained without significant progress in the area of disarmament. The international community already possesses the necessary tools to advance the disarmament process. What is required is the strengthening of existing disarmament treaty-based mechanisms with the full support and political will of States. Without political will, there cannot be a genuine solution to international disarmament issues. It is about time that we reorient ourselves towards the common objective of achieving general and complete disarmament.

In concluding, allow me to once again express my appreciation to the organisers for inviting me to address this important gathering and for the excellent hospitality extended.

Let us collectively today resolve that never again shall such destruction as witnessed by Hiroshima and Nagasaki be unleashed on our planet. Thank you for your kind attention.

Hisham Mohamed Mostafa Badr
Ambassador to Japan, Arab Republic of
Egypt

Ladies & Gentlemen,
Distinguished Guests,

It is both an honor and a privilege to be here in Hiroshima among you all and to participate today in the World Conference against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs representing the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt. Indeed Egypt has been especially honored to have been invited to participate in this important event for the past few years, and I would like to take this opportunity to express my profound admiration to all the distinguished members of the Organizing Committee for their sustained dedication and to commend the thousands of advocates who in the days to come will be joining their voices with ours in the service of international peace and justice and a world free of nuclear weapons. I also find it incumbent upon me, as we gather here in this great city, to pay homage and extend my tribute, on behalf of the Government and people of Egypt, to those valiant citizens of both Hiroshima and Nagasaki who have lost their lives or who continue

to suffer to this present day as a result of the atomic bombings that took place 62 years ago.

We gather here at this World Conference not only to solemnly commemorate the legacy of the tragic events that continue to scar these two cities, but more importantly to send a clear and unequivocal message that we can not, and will not, tolerate this untenable situation where all humankind continues to be at the mercy of the destructive power of the nuclear arsenals that exist in the world today. On the contrary, this Conference, along with the many events that will be held on its margins, are perhaps the most poignant reminder that the peoples of the world, and the Governments that stand united with them, will continue to press forward until we achieve our common goal of ridding the world of these ultimate weapons of mass destruction. And as you proceed on this most noble of causes, you will find that Egypt stands besides you, never ceasing to assume its responsibilities, and always advocating the cause of nuclear disarmament at all times and in all fora.

When the Government of Egypt ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 1981, it issued a statement that included the following paragraph:

“Egypt wishes to express its strong dissatisfaction at the nuclear-weapon States, in particular the two super-powers, because of their failure to take effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament. Consequently, Egypt avails itself of this opportunity to appeal to the nuclear-weapon States Parties to the Treaty to fulfill their obligations whereby the nuclear arms race will be stopped and nuclear disarmament achieved.”

This statement was issued over a quarter of a century ago, and yet the appeal we launched at the time is no less valid today than it was back then we acceded to this important international instrument. Indeed our message is all the more valid today in light of the abysmal failure of the nuclear weapon States to fulfill their legally binding obligations under the Treaty and reduce their nuclear stockpiles with a view towards their total elimination.

We have always maintained our conviction of the central role of the NPT in securing total and complete nuclear disarmament, in addition to halting the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons and guaranteeing the inalienable right of non-nuclear weapon States to peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This paramount role, however, has been seriously undermined by the less than satisfactory record of compliance by the five acknowledged nuclear weapon States in the realm of nuclear disarmament. We are equally concerned by those policies that aim to shift the balance of priority to nuclear non-proliferation

against the equal – and perhaps overriding – priority of nuclear disarmament and which ultimately serve to undermine the credibility of the Treaty and its overall implementation.

The NPT was undoubtedly never designed to allow the nuclear-weapon States to maintain their nuclear arsenals in perpetuity. Any effort to advocate otherwise is not only factually incorrect but also morally unacceptable. Indeed the Treaty acknowledged from the outset the transitional status of the capabilities of the nuclear-weapon States, and its very premise is based on the concept of individual and collective renunciation of nuclear weapons which will never be effective if applied partially or selectively.

Egypt continues to forcefully believe that the 13 practical steps adopted collectively in the 2000 NPT Review Conference constitute a detailed and effective work plan to move forward towards nuclear disarmament, and we will thus continue to urge the nuclear weapon States to comply fully with their obligations under Article VI of the Treaty. It remains our fervent belief that progress in implementing the 13 steps should be the foremost criterion in reviewing progress in the implementation of the Treaty and assessing compliance with its provisions by the nuclear weapon States.

At the same time, we must never tire from advocating the goal of ensuring the universality of the NPT, through pressing those States that remain outside the scope of the Treaty to sign and ratify it without any further delay. Securing the universalization of the treaty is in fact an essential prerequisite for maintaining the credibility of the NPT and promoting the goals of nuclear non-proliferation. Again, the NPT was never intended to remain non-universal, neither during its original 25 year term nor after its indefinite extension in 1995. Indeed the 1995 Decision on “Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament” had stressed that “universal adherence to the Treaty is an urgent priority” and that “every effort should be made by all States Parties to achieve this objective”.

The recently launched 2010 NPT review cycle affords us all an important opportunity to renew our collective commitment towards implementing the Treaty in all of its pillars and all of its provisions. This review process is in fact especially significant in lieu of the failure of the 2005 Review Conference to reach any substantive agreement. We must seize the chance to honestly assess the Treaty’s implementation, review its effectiveness and address its existing shortcomings. And we must never tire from holding the nuclear-weapon States to account until they fulfill their legal commitments and abide by the provisions of the Treaty.

Egypt for its part will continue to advocate this

goal and will spare no effort until it is fully and irreversibly achieved. We will continue to work with our many other partners in the international community to maximize our efforts, in particular with our partners in the New Agenda Coalition (NAC), namely Brazil, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden. We will also continue our sustained efforts within the United Nations General Assembly, including through the regular introduction of our resolutions on this matter and in particular the one entitled "Towards a nuclear weapon-free world" which has been receiving ever increasing levels of support every year. And we will always remain appreciative and supportive of the efforts of the thousands of organizations and millions of citizens who champion the cause of nuclear disarmament and who are aptly represented by all of you here today.

It is also important to state that while it will continue to champion the cause of global nuclear disarmament, Egypt also firmly believes that the establishment of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free-zones ultimately enhances global and regional peace and security and contributes towards realizing the objective of universal nuclear disarmament. This is particularly true in a region of tension such as the Middle East, where nuclear weapons cast their sinister shadow and further complicate an already complex situation. Concerned by the serious implications and strategic threats posed by these weapons in our region, Egypt has been advocating, since 1974, the establishment of a nuclear weapon-free-zone in the Middle East. We have been promoting this goal ever since in the UN General Assembly and the General Conference of the IAEA. And we have continued to reiterate the centrality of the resolution on the Middle East adopted during the 1995 NPT Review Conference and which ultimately allowed for the indefinite extension of the Treaty. Despite our sustained diplomatic efforts, and notwithstanding the fact that all the other countries of the region have acceded to the NPT, Israel remains the only country in the Middle East that remains outside the scope of the Treaty, maintains its nuclear arsenal, and refuses to place its nuclear facilities under full-scope IAEA safeguards. I thus ask you all, as you call on the nuclear weapon States to disarm, to also join your voice with ours and also call upon Israel to do the same and to open the way towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free-zone in the Middle East.

Our commitment to stand with you, as we are doing today, will not end with the conclusion of this World Conference. On the contrary, our presence and participation in this event will only galvanize our determination to continue to press forward until we achieve our common goal. And as we do so, we shall always commemorate the

memory of the victims who have fallen here in Hiroshima and in Nagasaki 62 years ago. I am thus exceptionally honored that the Japan Council against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs has decided to send a delegation to Egypt in October to organize a photographic exhibition on the damage caused by the atomic bombings and to promote public awareness of and support for the cause of nuclear disarmament. These kinds of activities, along with our efforts at the governmental level, will undoubtedly bring us all closer to achieving our common aspirations for a nuclear-free world.

Dr. Mohamed Ezzeldine Abdel-Moneim
Professor, Suez Canal University /
Special Advisor on Disarmament and
Strategic Affairs, League of Arab States

Thanks to the Japan Council against Nuclear and Hydrogen Bombs for organizing this international meeting. Pilgrimage to Hiroshima is always a matter of great interest, it helps to reflect with activists and militants committed to the cause of world peace on how to contribute to the establishment of a world free of the threat of nuclear weapons. This would entail thinking about the past, the present and the future. The future should not be conceived without genuine nuclear disarmament. For the present, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is certainly not sufficient. As for the past, an appraisal of the origins of the nuclear attacks against Hiroshima and Nagasaki is indispensable for future action regarding nuclear disarmament.

Last year, there was some reflection on whether the commander of the *Enola Gay*, the aircraft that dropped the A-bomb on Hiroshima, should be brought before a court of law for committing a crime against humanity, war crime and genocide. That was because this officer, it was reported, said at the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima, among all the grievances and remembrance of human suffering, that he did not feel guilty about committing this act and that he would do it again if so ordered.

This year, a Japanese-American film maker said that he interviewed some of the US airmen who were on the planes that dropped the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and none of them expressed any regret. Actually, one American scientist told him that, by dropping the nuclear bomb, they did a favor to Nagasaki's then large Catholic population by "getting them to God faster." The Japanese-American filmmaker said that what was surprising to him was that those people appeared to consciously have learned very little about what happened on the ground and that they were very ignorant of atomic radiation. One of them, a former director at the famous Los

Alamos told him something like “it’s more dangerous to cross the street.”

* * *

More significant, however, also last year, one Japanese activist reacted to the talk on the nuclear bombings against Hiroshima and Nagasaki as crimes against humanity and genocide by asking the question: “What about Pearl Harbor?” Since he, by all means, was not the only one to ask this question, the question needs to be credibly addressed.

This question has two implications. One is that the attack on Pearl Harbor on one hand, and the nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki on the other, were comparable. The second is that there was a causal link between the attack on Pearl Harbor and the nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Had not there been an attack on Pearl Harbor, would Hiroshima and Nagasaki been attacked by nuclear weapons?

These two implications, when thoroughly examined in a historic perspective, should lead to different conclusions. One is that the attack on Pearl Harbor, was not, as was the case of the attacks against Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a form of “strategic bombing”, that is to say bombing in depth of installations which, though not strictly military, would contribute to the war-making capacity of a nation such as defense industry or naval supply lines, etc., but not a school or hospital. The attack on Pearl Harbor was specifically targeted against a military base, its installations, warships, planes, and other weapons and not against civilian installations in Hawaii including schools, homes, post offices and the like.

The nuclear attacks against Hiroshima and Nagasaki were targeted against city-centers and, with the magnitude of a nuclear explosion, it was known in advance, there was no distinction whatsoever between civilian and military. With the massive killings of civilians and the full destruction of whole cities, the nuclear attacks against Hiroshima and Nagasaki went far beyond the doctrine of strategic bombing and stand until this day as the biggest abuse in history of this doctrine. The attack on Pearl Harbor and the nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were totally incomparable in terms of scope and magnitude, though one should insist on the deep regret for the loss of human life on both sides, civilian and military alike.

The Pearl Harbor attack undoubtedly triggered the war in the Pacific which continued for several years and came to an end *after* the nuclear attacks against the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The view prevailed all over the world was that the long war in the Pacific, which broke out because of the attack on Pearl Harbor, came to an end *because* of the nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Expert literature, however, particularly

in recent years, continued to put this view in question.

But the fact is that, shortly after the end of the Second World War, a committee made of distinguished American scholars, diplomats, scientists and military experts inquired into the course of the war in the Pacific and concluded at the end of a detailed and voluminous report that the war-making capacity of Japan was already destroyed prior to the nuclear bombings against Hiroshima and Nagasaki. There was no point at all in the nuclear bombings of the two cities.

This conclusion was later shared by several ex-Presidents, military analysts and historians both in the United States and abroad and, seemingly, it continues to gain more grounds. To say that the attack on Pearl Harbor triggered the long and fierce war in the Pacific is one thing and to claim that it justified the nuclear attacks against Hiroshima and Nagasaki is another. That is why the question *and what about Pearl Harbor?*, implying a causal link between that attack and the nuclear attacks against the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, could not stand the test of history.

* * *

Nevertheless, the report which concluded that there was no point in the nuclear attacks against Hiroshima and Nagasaki was, amazingly, available by the end of 1945 or early 1946, not very long after the attacks took place. The fact that its astounding conclusion was neither popular nor popularized was mainly due to the school of thought persisting since the end of the Second World War. This school says that the best thing to do among former belligerents is to turn the war pages over, forget about it and look forward for a constructive future, an argument whose merits nobody can afford to deny. Another school believes, instead, that facing past realities in an objective manner free of creating taboos is more conducive to a constructive dialogue leading to a well-established partnership. In fact, the two schools are not alternatives, and the wealth of information available and historical evidence revealed should supplement, rather than contradict, the willingness to achieve a world free from the threat of nuclear weapons.

* * *

The debate on the origins of the nuclear bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki would certainly continue but it cannot be left within the narrow confines of national, bilateral or even regional relationships. Nuclear weapons are weapons of global implications, and their possession or use affects the survival of mankind. And if one concedes to whatever justification of the nuclear attacks against the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, this will imply a justification of nuclear bombings anywhere in the future. Every city will become a future Hiroshima and each town

will be a potential Nagasaki. Any argument implying justification of the nuclear attacks against Hiroshima and Nagasaki is in fact as devastating as nuclear weapons themselves. It would undermine international negotiations on nuclear disarmament, already in continuous recess, and could further encourage successive waves of nuclear proliferation. Nuclear weapons are the only weapons capable of destroying our planet and endangering our universe. The concept of nuclear deterrence, no matter how long it survived, is so fragile and may well be doomed to collapse or failure. The lesson of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is: complete elimination of nuclear weapons and total ban on their production.

Panel Two: Representatives of Anti-Nuclear Peace Movements:

Lim Pil-Soo
Chief of Executive Committee
People's Solidarity for Social Progress
Republic of Korea

1. Korean Peninsula nuclear crisis and solidarity between South Korea and Japan

On October 9, 2006, immediately after North Korea's announcement of its defiant implementation of nuclear weapons test, South Korea's monthly opinion magazine *Shin Tong-A* published a book entitled, "Nuclear Sovereignty of the Republic of Korea." The subtitle of the book was "the Denuclearization Declaration has been breached. Let us enrich, too." A careful examination of the book's arguments is necessary because it reflects the opinion of conservatives, the mainstream force in South Korea. I would like to sum up the arguments of the book.

First point: It argues, "there are three things that are preventing South Korea from realizing nuclear sovereignty: The 1956 ROK-US Agreement on Atomic Energy, Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), of which South Korea became a member in 1975, and the Declaration of Denuclearization of Korean Peninsula of 1991. Of those, the Denuclearization Declaration was breached with the North Korea's withdrawal from the NPT, uranium enrichment program and nuclear testing. Therefore, a revision of the ROK-US Agreement on Atomic Energy would enable us also to conduct uranium enrichment and nuclear reprocessing."

Second point: "With the revision of Japan-US Agreement on Atomic Energy in 1988, Japan became the only country which possesses plutonium without the possession of nuclear weapons. In 1988, Japan was permitted to build the Rokkasho nuclear reprocessing plant, which

enabled it to complete a nuclear fuel cycle. The situation where only Japan accumulates several hundred thousand tons of plutonium is a serious threat. Therefore, South Korea must have a nuclear program of its own to achieve an equal capacity of that of Japan at least. The revised Japan-US Atomic Energy Agreement is the future model for our new agreement with the U.S."

And third point: "President Bush is promoting the extended use of nuclear energy. The US is likely to promote the production of the 4th generation nuclear power plants and the state-of-the-art nuclear fuel cycle. South Korea should also establish innovative nuclear energy technology and commit itself to the fresh global trend of nuclear energy production."

These arguments accurately reflect the logic of conservative forces in my country. A logic that South Korea's military power has to be strengthened within the solid military alliance with the United States, by underlining the immediate threat of North Korea and the potential threat of Japan. What's notable in this is the utilization of the militant and ultra-nationalistic ideology and the attempt to totally disguise the true intent for a nuclear weapons program in the name of peaceful use of nuclear energy, i.e. nuclear power production.

If we buy this logic that "nuclear power production is one thing and nuclear weapons development is another", we will eventually find ourselves developing nuclear weapons. Historically speaking, nuclear power plants have always had a second covert purpose of developing technology and materials for nuclear weapons production. Simply put, the US Nuclear Posture Report proposes an increase of the country's annual production of nuclear warheads from 350 to 600. That would require the increase of nuclear power plants for fresh production of plutonium.

The United States attempts to strengthen its ability to attack and defend with, and production of nuclear weapons and revive its nuclear power industry, and Japan's continued policy on the use of plutonium based on fast-breeder reactors and nuclear reprocessing plants must become the primary subject of our criticism. Especially, South Korea's peace and anti-nuclear movements must firmly resist the efforts of conservative forces for implanting Japan's nuclear policy into our country.

2. Debates within South Korea's people's movements since North Korea's nuclear testing

In the 1980s, with the rise of people's movements, the issues of US nuclear war planning in Korean Peninsula, of US nuclear weapons deployment in South Korea, and of military exercises for nuclear warfare became important

points of debate. The sense of warning on the danger of nuclear weapons was quite strong at least among the mass movements. Therefore, almost all of them supported campaigns against the construction of nuclear waste dumping sites and many were actively involved in those campaigns.

North Korea's attempt to acquire nuclear weapons, however, has confounded the movements, generating a quite strong tendency to defend North Korea's move. The argument was that North Korea's attempt was different from the US nuclear dominance and nuclear imperialism. It was, they say, military deterrence at its minimum, aimed at preventing the US nuclear war plan against North Korea from being implemented, and a bargaining tool for successful negotiations on the normalization of relationship with the United States. In other words, the argument is that North Korea's nuclear armament is a means of "just war", or at least something that should not be criticized on the same level with the US nuclear threat.

We should, however, criticize such apologetic arguments on three reasons. Firstly, there is no meaning in differentiating "just war" from "wrong war" in nuclear warfare. Nuclear war will only bring absolute destruction upon people, leading to mutual destruction. Secondly, the way of thinking that nuclear possession is the only means to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war lacks the understanding that the very possession is an incentive for war. And the third reason is that North Korea's nuclear attempt is a reflection of the global trend of nuclear proliferation, and thus has the effect of enhancing this trend. Therefore, we must be uncompromising and relentless in pressing that the way to eliminate the possibility of US nuclear war in Korean Peninsula is the proliferation of mass movements against nuclear weapons and for peace, not nuclear armaments.

3. Success of the East Asian Peace Conference against War, Nuclear Proliferation

The "East Asian Peace Conference against War, Nuclear Proliferation" was initiated by several South Korean organizations that shared the views mentioned before. The South Korean Organizing Committee of the conference understood the meaning of the Korean nuclear crisis in the context of the global nuclear arms race and US military imperialism, and shared the need to promote solidarity in East Asia, especially with Japan's anti-nuclear movements, which have rich experiences since the 1950s.

Based on the common understanding, we organized the East Asian Peace Conference against War, Nuclear Proliferation on May 26-28 at Seoul University under the banner, "an East Asia without nuclear weapons", and "an East Asia free

of US military imperialism." A variety of social movement groups, activists and citizens took part in the organizing committee, including labor unions, peace, religionist and environmental groups and progressive political parties. The international conference was participated in by more than 100 members of Japan Gensuikyo (the Japan Council against A & H Bombs) and more than 300 people from within and outside of the country. The reason why the number of South Korean participants was less than the organizer expected is a reflection of still insufficient recognition of nuclear issues among the country's social movements. Despite that, we were able to confirm a number of valuable results of the conference.

First: A majority of Koreans see Japan's suffering from the atomic bombings as a punishment for the historic crime of its imperial invasion and colonization, or they recognize it as something asymmetrically focused on the victim side of the Japanese. This has led to successive governments intentional negligence of Korean A-bomb victims, whose number is estimated to be about 50,000 in Hiroshima (of which 30,000 died) - and about 20,000 in Nagasaki (of which 10,000 died.) We believe, however, that the East Asian Peace Conference has given the opportunity for both sides of our movements to build relationship for working together, fostering the universality and legitimacy of peace/anti-nuclear movements.

Secondly, the conference provided a first-hand opportunity for us to learn from Japan's peace movements of their active campaigns against the attempt of revising Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. The conference renewed its understanding that the issue of Japan's constitutional change is not an issue only for Japan but something that should be addressed at regional and global levels. South Korean activists who took part in the conference took the opportunity and launched "South Korean Citizens for the Preservation of the Japanese Peace Constitution," upholding a slogan, "Let us make Article 9 the constitution of East Asia!"

Finally, the conference was an opportunity for those working against US military bases amidst the ongoing transformation of US military forces in the East Asia to get to know each other and their campaigns and newly-build relationships. Last year, to resist the US plan to rebuild a large-scale military base in the south of Han Gang, the People's Task Force against the Expansion of Pyong Taek was established and it waged vigorous campaigns. Unfortunately, the Task Force had to make a gut-wrenching decision to relocate the local residents, and the movement is at a standstill. The situation needs to be overcome through mutual exchange of experiences and taking vigorous solidarity building activities among peace

movements.

4. Peace/Anti-Nuclear Movement and Solidarity between South Korea and Japan

According to an opinion poll in August 2005 conducted on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the US atomic bombings, 86% of the people in Japan and 93% in Germany were against their countries' nuclear armament. On the contrary, 52% of South Koreans were in favor of their country's nuclear armament. What is most worrying is the impetus North Korea's nuclear testing has given to the illusion that North Korea's nuclear weapons may be ultimately maintained as unified Korea's nuclear bombs, and would give Korea a competitive edge in its nuclear arms race in the region, vis-à-vis Japan and China.

While a great majority of Japanese people opposed to the country's possession of nuclear weapons, the levels of Japan's nuclear technology and material development are quite high. On the other hand, more than half of South Koreans are overt or potential supporters of nuclear armament despite its relatively low technology level in its nuclear weapons development. The worst scenario expected is that the present situations in South Korea and Japan could have synergetic effects with one another, escalating the situation into nuclear armament of both countries.

Also, the recent accidents at the nuclear power plants at Kashiwazaki-Kariwa in Japan reminded the two countries of the existing danger of nuclear power plants. Both countries are highly dependent on nuclear energy for power generation, thus the present situation of their sharing a dire danger to the region is a very serious issue.

In every respect, from the triangle military alliance among the US, ROK, Japan, to the synergetic effects of South Korea's and Japan's political ideologies and the nuclear-energy-dependant economic models, the struggles of and solidarity between our two countries' anti-nuclear peace movements are urgently needed than ever before. I am confident that this conference will be a place of sharing ideas and wisdom to tackle our joint struggles.

Niu Qiang Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament (CPAPD) China

Mr. President, on behalf of my Chinese colleagues present here and myself, I wish to sincerely thank the Organizing Committee for kindly inviting us to attend this long-standing and important annual international conference. I could remember with much pleasure that three years ago, I was here exchanging and sharing views,

which I found most enlightening and rewarding, with participants from Japan and other countries. I do hope through this year's conference, especially through frank exchanges of views and sincere interactions both in the sessions and outside the sessions, that we can learn more from each other, deepen our mutual understanding and cooperation, build on the friendships among us, and demonstrate more forcefully our common aspirations and solidarity for our shared objective, for our common cause.

Mr. President, Dear Friends, the theme of this year's conference is For a Nuclear Weapons-Free, Peaceful, and Just World. This is a theme of the most importance and of the greatest urgency. It is also a theme of vision, of putting into practice concrete steps. Before I speak about our positions regarding these concrete steps towards our common objectives, I would like, in the first place, to share with you some of my observations on the current international security situation in general and on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in particular.

It is my view that, at present, the overall international situation continues to undergo profound and complicated changes. While peace, development, and cooperation represent the general trend of our times and the overall stability of the international situation has been basically maintained, the world keeps witnessing regional turmoils and tensions. In terms of traditional security threats, local wars and violent conflicts keep increasing and intensifying. In 2006, there were forty-four local wars and armed conflicts, five more than 2005. Some people regard last year as a peak year since the end of the Cold War in terms of the occurrence of armed conflicts. With regard to non-traditional security threats, there occurred 597 terrorist incidents that killed more than 4500 people and injured 9700, an increase of 65 percent, 55 percent, and 35 percent respectively, as compared with the statistics from 2005. In addition, threats arising from the proliferation of WMDs, from transnational crimes, from infectious diseases, and from climate change have been on the rise.

In the international security arena, people can easily discern two salient features: First, the threats to the world community today have become more diversified; that is to say, they have become more multi-faceted. Second, traditional and non-traditional threats have become more intertwined. These diversified and intermingled threats pose severe challenges to our endeavors to maintain world peace and stability. It is commonly recognized that nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation are closely linked with overall international security. If we achieve a more favorable international security environment, it may be easier to push for nuclear disarmament

and non-proliferation. Conversely, if the international security environment deteriorates the process of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation will unavoidably be slowed down or stopped, or even reversed. Therefore, to push for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, it is all the more necessary to make every effort to improve the overall international security environment on the basis of strictly observing the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-Existence, and other universally recognized norms governing international relations. Of course, at the same time, it is also imperative to make vigorous efforts to strive directly for nuclear disarmament, for non-proliferation, for de-nuclearization, and for more nuclear weapons-free zones so as to create a favorable international security environment for the final elimination of all nuclear weapons.

It is known to all that the process of nuclear disarmament has long been at a stalemate with the international non-proliferation regime in a precarious state. To save time, I do not want to go into the details about the setbacks and frustrations that we have seen over the past years. It can be said that a number of factors have contributed to the present worrying situation in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation; however, one cannot but point out one clear major factor: the perverse, obstinate pursuit of a global strategy of establishing a mono-polar world by the United States through nuclear supremacy. Consequently, we have witnessed the active moves of the United States to seek absolute military superiority and security by strengthening its military alliances, improving its weapons systems, deploying its global missile system, all under the name of fighting terrorism. Now, there have emerged the dangerous trends of lowering the threshold for use of nuclear weapons and of developing new nuclear weapons. And the tendency towards a new round of arms races is again rearing its ugly head. There is no exaggeration to say, so far as the possible use of nuclear weapons is concerned, that the current international security situation is no less dangerous than that during the Cold War.

Under these circumstances, we in civil society peace organizations must further raise our voices to confront the increasing danger of the spread of nuclear weapons and other WMDs. We must do everything possible to prevent and eliminate the possibility that they could eventually be used. The organization I am representing, the Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament, has long been advocating the total prohibition and thorough destruction of all nuclear weapons. At the same time, we have always expressed our firm support for the following necessary and concrete steps in that direction.

First, all nuclear-weapons states should make public commitments to the complete prohibition and the thorough destruction of all nuclear weapons and should conclude an international legal instrument for these purposes at an early date.

Second, before achieving the goal of complete prohibition and the thorough destruction of all nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapons states should abandon nuclear deterrent policy based on the first use of nuclear weapons. Further, these states should guarantee not to use nuclear weapons and not to threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states or regions, providing negative and positive security assurances to all non-nuclear-weapons states. At the same time, the two countries with the largest nuclear arsenals bear special responsibility for taking the lead in further reducing their nuclear stockpiles in a verifiable and irreversible way so as to create favorable conditions for the complete prohibition and the total destruction of all nuclear weapons.

Third, the role of nuclear weapons in national security policy formulation should be greatly downgraded. The present lowering of the threshold for using small nuclear weapons should be immediately reversed and nuclear weapons deployed on foreign soil should be withdrawn. At the same time, all nuclear weapons states should respect and support the efforts of different countries and regions to become nuclear weapons-free countries or zones on the basis of voluntary consultations and decisions. To this end, nuclear-weapons states should sign relevant agreements at an early date.

Fourth, to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, it is imperative and essential to address both the symptoms and the root causes of nuclear proliferation in a holistic way. We stand for adopting and practicing a new security concept based on mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality, and cooperation, going beyond ideological differences and the superiority complex concerning so-called common values to work together for the common security of mankind, not the absolute security of one country, not the security of a group of countries with missile defense systems or so-called common values. Only by so doing can a favorable international security environment be created to provide the needed conditions for achieving a nuclear weapons-free world step by step. Some facts show that in resolving regional nuclear proliferation problems it is essential to persevere in dialogue, negotiations, and confidence building in a collective framework with multilateral efforts. The recent encouraging progress in tackling the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula is a case in point.

Dear Friends and Colleagues, to completely eliminate all nuclear weapons and to realize a

nuclear weapons-free world are our shared aspirations. It is true that in recent years due to some obvious negative developments in the international security situation, nuclear disarmament has met with stalemate, frustration, and even setback; however, we have never, for a minute, ceased our struggle. We have always believed that so long as there is strong political will and determination, so long as the international community increases the pressure on nuclear-weapons states and persists in taking actions to help create the necessary international environment for their total elimination, the goal of establishing a nuclear weapons-free world can certainly be achieved. We are convinced, since mankind had the capability to invent and to develop nuclear weapons, it must have the wisdom and capability to eliminate them. We know very well that in the struggle for eliminating nuclear weapons we cannot afford to lose. Therefore, we must unite all forces worldwide in the broadest united front on our march to a nuclear weapons-free, peaceful, and just world. Thank you!

David Webb
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
United Kingdom

It is a great honour for me to be here today at such an important gathering and a privilege to speak on behalf of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) in the UK.

With the "Doomsday Clock" of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* now set at five minutes to midnight this is a particularly important time for us to come together. Here in Hiroshima we are reminded of what nuclear weapons can do and have done - but in this gathering we are also reminded of the numbers and strength of people throughout the world who continue to work tirelessly to abolish weapons of mass destruction and create a safe and peaceful world.

A major problem that we face today is the aggressive foreign policy of the current US administration. This is causing particular difficulties within Europe. There is widespread disagreement and discussion on the development of military objectives for the European Union, the growth of NATO and the existence and possible expansion of US military bases in Europe (especially for national missile defence). The UK is often at odds with other members of Europe on these issues. The Blair government has been a major ally of the US and, despite some of the largest popular protests and demonstrations in our history, took us into an illegal and disastrous war in Iraq.

The UK is still home to over 100 US nuclear weapons at the Lakenheath base in Suffolk and other US bases played a key role in the build up to and eventual war on Iraq. The UK government has agreed to the use of 2 bases at Fylingdales and Menwith Hill in Yorkshire as key components of the US national missile defence system. If this system were to ever work it would provide the US with the ability to carry out a first strike on another country in the knowledge that any retaliation can be effectively neutralised. The US is now also pressing strongly for missile defence bases to be positioned in the Czech Republic and Poland. Russia is very concerned about these new bases and how they may affect the effectiveness of the Russian deterrent. An international conference in London on 1st September organised by CND will co-ordinate European-wide opposition to US and NATO plans for Missile Defence bases in Europe.

Earlier this year in March, the UK Parliament held its first ever debate on the future of the UK nuclear weapons system. Although the government eventually won the parliamentary vote to renew the nuclear Trident submarine system, it suffered its biggest rebellion on domestic policy since coming to power in 1997 and the biggest overall since the Iraq war in 2003. The government was forced to make important concessions on its original plan and Parliament will now have to make further separate decisions on the submarines, missiles and warheads. This means that there will be further opportunities to reverse the decision. CND is leading on the campaign to build on the significant opposition already present.

An opinion poll taken just before the vote on Trident replacement showed that 64% of the British public want the government to support a Convention banning all nuclear weapons. CND is a partner in the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) which is demanding a Nuclear Weapons Convention and will be hosting a major international conference on nuclear disarmament in London next February. I hope that many of you here will be able to come and participate. The conference will also coincide with the 60th anniversary of CND which will help to maximise publicity.

Tony Blair's enthusiastic support of the war in Iraq has been so unpopular that it has led to his having to step down as Prime Minister. It is still not clear whether the new Gordon Brown led government will behave very differently. The new Foreign Secretary, David Miliband, has promised to 'listen as well as lead' and this has been described as a new beginning for British foreign policy." However, we remember previous announcements by the Blair government that their foreign policy would have "an ethical dimension" - this was soon dropped and replaced by more

traditional strategies. So, although we are hopeful that the new UK government might be beginning to distance itself from the US and may be starting to consider taking their obligations to nuclear disarmament seriously – nevertheless, we remain wary, as other statements have emphasised the importance of a strong relationship between the UK and US. In addition, the Brown government has recently granted of permission for the US to use their Menwith Hill base as part of their national missile defence programme, with no consultation, discussion or debate with European partners, parliament or the general public.

Even so, there is considerable pressure on the government to pull out of Iraq as soon as possible and an early withdrawal might yet be announced. Recent extreme weather conditions have highlighted people's concerns about climate change being the most urgent problem that has to be tackled. The huge sums of money diverted to war, missile defence and nuclear weapons obviously mean that the immediate problems and challenges of floods, heat waves and water shortages, that are affecting people now, cannot be tackled properly. People are beginning to ask questions about where resources and funding are focussed.

People are also questioning how the government's policies for tackling terrorism are resulting in the erosion of civil liberties. The rights to free speech and peaceful demonstration are being threatened and curtailed. The illegal snatching of people from the streets, the abuse and torture of Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib add to the horror stories of Iraq, Afghanistan and the Middle East. We are increasingly made aware of the futility and inhumanity of war. For our part we will continue to remind people that the possession and threatened use of nuclear weapons is immoral and illegal and that we have an obligation, and an ability, to create change.

We are inspired by the dedication and passion for peace shown by the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Mayors for Peace movement has captured the imagination of hundreds of civic representatives and thousands of citizens. CND will continue to work to ensure that people's desire for a truly peaceful and secure future is realised. We will continue to campaign for the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction and continue to demonstrate, protest, lobby and educate to achieve that end. We recognise the importance of working together, of trust and cooperation, tolerance and understanding.

No more Hiroshimas, no more Nagasakis, no nuclear weapons anywhere on Earth.

Francois Gagnaire
French Peace Movement
France

Dear peaceful friends, first, on behalf of the members of the French Peace Movement, I would like to express the deep emotion we felt on hearing of the tragic death of Iccho Ito, the mayor of Nagasaki. We offer our sincere condolences to his family. With his murder, peaceful people have lost sight of a man of bravery and convictions.

Achieving nuclear disarmament is not at all an easy task and requires endless effort on our part. Our actions and successes give us the confidence to foresee better times, fairer times, when we will not be mere slaves of nuclear masters. The difficulty we have been confronting for several years is that the political discussion has been focused essentially on the identification of risks and threats. This has created a false consensus for the necessity of nuclear weapons. These unconventional weapons are more and more being considered as conventional ones, and in this way, it is forgotten that the use of any weapon betrays humanity. Nowadays, unfortunately, the real matter is not how and when nuclear weapons will be used but if international law will be respected or not.

During the NPT PrepCom last May, states party to the treaty agreed on the urgency of containing proliferation through the observance of commitments; however, France showed unprecedented arrogance by prohibiting others to do what she allows herself to do. In fact, France actively participates in vertical proliferation by modernizing, among other things, two vectors (M-51 and ASMP-A) of its nuclear arsenal:

1) The M-51 Missile: from 2010, M-51.1 missiles will replace M-45 missiles on board four new-generation-launcher nuclear submarines (SNLE-NG) carrying sixteen missiles each. Each M-51.1 missile can contain up to six TN-75 nuclear warheads, each with an explosive power of 110 kilotons. In 2015, improved M-51.2 missiles, equipped with TNO warheads, will be put into service. While M-45 missiles have a range of about 6,000 kilometers, these new missiles will have an estimated maximum range of over 10,000 kilometers. This will allow the SNLE-NG fleet to expand its patrol zones and thus become more difficult to locate, so we are far away from a homeland defence strategy: we are in an attack strategy totally in contradiction to the concepts of deterrence. Last 19 June, some French peace activists prevented the second test of this missile by carrying out a citizens' inspection, an action kept secret until the last minute. Unfortunately, the test was rescheduled and took place on 21 June.

2) The Improved Air-to-Ground Medium Range Missile (ASMP-A): this pre-strategic nuclear missile is a missile of last-warning before a

submarine strike. These missiles will replace the eighty-seven current ASMP missiles starting from next year. The ASMP-A will be equipped with an airborne nuclear warhead (TNA) with a yield equivalent to twenty Hiroshima-type bombs. An ASMP-A will have a range of 500 kilometers. It has great penetration capacity thanks to its supersonic speed, its easy handling, its furtiveness, its resistance to the effects of other nuclear explosions, and its variety of possible trajectories. By introducing the ASMP-A, Nicolas Sarkozy, the new President of the Republic, is strengthening France's nuclear and military power. The real break with the past, to use his favorite phrase, is that France will start to respect the NPT process by announcing concrete measures for nuclear disarmament.

But France also seems to be playing a role in horizontal proliferation. In his 13 July 2007 speech on the French military and the place of France in the world, Nicolas Sarkozy did not mention a word about the United Nations, multilateralism, and international law. Indeed, some French political lobbies see French and British nuclear weapons becoming European. This will give lasting legitimacy to the use of nuclear weapons for European Union security. While our leaders seek vertical and horizontal proliferation, we know that the true security of Europe lies not in nuclear weapons but in a Europe without nuclear weapons. The situation, therefore, is very worrisome and does not augur anything good unless public opinion reacts to meet the reactionary political challenge in time.

Moreover, the defence ministry has recently confirmed that defence expenditures will be kept around 2% of the gross national product; these fools argue that 2% of a nation's wealth is not too much to ask for ensuring life and for giving France the power to keep its rank among the top nations of the world. But we know that in absolute terms, 2% is an unreasonable amount, and that militarism cannot ensure life, actually reducing France's rank in the world.

In the face of the insane and illegal modernization of nuclear arsenals by nuclear-weapons states that reign on the Olympia of power, the credibility of the NPT is diminished. The treaty, however, remains the only cornerstone for nuclear disarmament. This is why, after meetings with ambassadors of both nuclear and non-nuclear states on the occasion of the NPT Prepcom, we have identified four demands on which we want to concentrate our actions to further the success of the 2010 NPT Review Conference: firstly, we must demand the universal application of the NPT, enforcing Article VI, the real centerpiece of the treaty; secondly, we must demand that all states sign and ratify the CTBT, requiring the cessation of all experimental nuclear

weapons explosions; thirdly, we must demand the implementation of the Fissile Materials Cut Off Treaty, which will limit the number of nuclear weapons with a view to extensive multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament; and, lastly, the implementation of a nuclear weapons-free zone in the Near East, making the region more stable and easing international relations at the same time.

But as I said before, France has got a new President. The presidential campaign was marked by strong appeals to the citizenship, an auspicious move toward greater democracy. But to conceive of peace as a culture between peoples, of peace as an essential vehicle of societal change, we have a long way to go on working on raising the consciousness of the citizenry for committed action. During this election campaign, the French Peace Movement took up the challenge of informing citizens to make real choices. To this end, we wrote thirty urgent demands for the building of a peace culture, and we submitted these demands to political candidates. Some of them—those in favour of nuclear disarmament—took the time to answer our demands in a detailed and analytical way, announcing precise commitments. Some others—those in favour of nuclear deterrence—only gave courtesy responses. The rest—those like Nicolas Sarkozy—did not answer at all. Unfortunately, our efforts did not result in success. Although the outcome was not as good as we had expected in terms of media coverage and of electoral outcome, our approach has minimally introduced the issue of nuclear disarmament into the debate. Yet, with European elections drawing closer, we will continue to solicit responses from candidates to our thirty urgent demands. We will do that because the U.S. plan to deploy a missile defense system in Europe will seriously deter the establishment of a nuclear weapons-free zone in Europe and will send a multipolar Cold War wind blowing across Europe. Facing this crisis, European pacifists gathered last May and launched an appeal calling for the immediate cancellation of the missile defense installation plan.

As this situation has emerged to top our numerous concerns, we have decided to organize in this coming autumn meetings in the biggest cities across France for a world of solidarity without nuclear weapons that will culminate in a national action day on 8 December 2007, the twentieth anniversary of the very first agreement limiting European missiles. We will also organize young people in a new International Forum for the Promotion of Peace Culture in the beginning of summer 2008, meeting near a military base at which French nuclear submarines are deployed. Young people want to approach peace in its

diversity, including nuclear disarmament. A citizen inspection of the submarine base is planned: hundreds of young people will march in front of the military base, demanding the elimination of nuclear weapons. This will send a message.

In concluding, I believe we are in a favourable current. Public opinion has just begun to speak for a massive struggle for the elimination of nuclear weapons. It is for us to encourage this public opinion day by day, giving it our closest attention. Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Gerson
Director of Programs, New England Office,
American Friends Service Committee
USA

Overcoming Empire and the Bomb

I want to thank Gensuikyo for the opportunity to rejoin the World Conference. It is an irreplaceable forum for deepening our understandings of what nuclear weapons have done to human beings and the increasing danger that the U.S. or other nations will initiate genocidal nuclear war. Here we can learn, be revitalized by the Japanese peace movement, and find ways to deepen collaborations.

This is a dangerous but hopeful time. The nuclear powers still possess nearly 30,000 genocidal and omnicidal nuclear weapons.¹ Nuclear weapons proliferation poses a growing threat, reinforced by the nuclear powers' hypocritical insistence that they can maintain and develop arsenals of annihilation and ignore Article VI of the NPT while others must remain nuclear free. A second force driving proliferation is the U.S. practice of threatening to initiate nuclear war. President Bush has joined every U.S. President since Truman who, on more than thirty crises and wars prepared and threatened to initiate nuclear war.² Bush and leading Republican and Democratic presidential candidates have threatened that "all options must be on the table" in confronting Iran, and nuclear-capable aircraft carrier fleets have been sent to the Persian Gulf.

North Korea and possibly Iran have concluded that they need *deterrent* nuclear forces. This could spur proliferation to Arab countries, and Prime Minister Abe's and Foreign Minister Aso's visions of a nuclear-armed Japan must be taken seriously. Meanwhile the U.S. is building military and alliance structures to contain China.

This is best understood in the context of the U.S. Empire in decline. The invasion of Iraq was the greatest strategic blunder in U.S. history. The President of the elite Council on Foreign Relations

is hardly alone in believing that Bush's war will result in "the end of the American era" in the Middle East. The U.S. is also suffering imperial overreach. Its power is jeopardized by the twin towers of debt: the war-related deficit and the nation's unsustainable trade imbalance. China is about to replace the U.S. as the world's top manufacturing nation, and the dollar has plummeted to record lows against the Euro and British pound.³

U.S. Nuclear Terrorism

The destruction of Hiroshima in nine seconds is "understandable" only in the context of empire. The A-bombings were fundamentally evil, and U.S. leaders knew it.⁴ Today the U.S. strategic arsenal consists of thousands of weapons which, on average, are 20 times more powerful than the Hiroshima A-bomb. Each can murder more people than Hitler did at Auschwitz.

For reasons that differ from ours, a sector of the U.S. elite now understands that nuclear weapons no longer serve U.S. interests. The *Wall Street Journal* article by Henry Kissinger, George Schultz and others indicates they now understand that nuclear hypocrisy is a losing strategy.⁵ Unfortunately, Bush and most who seek to succeed him, remain infatuated with nuclear weapons or are subservient to military and other vested interests that depend on them.

The Bush-Cheney nuclear agenda includes

- The first-strike nuclear policy
- Building and deploying "missile defenses" -- shields to reinforce U.S. first-strike nuclear swords
- Developing more "usable" nuclear weapons
- A \$150 billion expansion of the nuclear weapons production infrastructure
- Unilateral enforcement of non-proliferation, while undermining the NPT
- Discriminatory nuclear weapons proliferation: rewarding India, turning a blind eye to Israel, and threatening North Korea, Iran, and Iraq
- Letting START I expire with nothing to replace it
- Refusing to ratify the CTBT or to negotiate a verifiable Fissile Material Cut Off Treaty

The problem is not limited to Bush and his extremists. When President Clinton said nuclear weapons are "the cornerstone of our policies", he meant that the foundation of U.S. policies is preparation and threats to inflict nuclear genocide. Hillary Clinton spoke for leading Democrats. When asked if by saying that "all options should be on the table" with Tehran she meant that the U.S. should be threatening all of Iran's women and

children with genocide, she answered: "I meant what I said."

Armitage-Nye

U.S. leaders have believed that if the U.S. is to be the world's dominant power it must control Asia. Eight years ago, faced by growing Chinese economic and military power, the Armitage-Nye report urged deepening the U.S.-Japan alliance, the central axis of the U.S. hub and spokes system for Asia-Pacific dominance. Written by senior Republican and Democratic mandarins, it reflected a bipartisan Washington consensus. At its core is the understanding that twice in the 20th century the world's dominant powers failed to integrate rising powers into their systems, resulting in catastrophic world wars. Thus Armitage-Nye urged integrating China into the U.S.-Japanese dominated system.

Economic growth is China's priority. It seeks a "peaceful rise" built on deep and stable relations with its neighbors. This has not, however, stilled U.S. fears that in time China's increased power and influence in Asia will displace that of the U.S.

On the eve of the 2008 Presidential election, Armitage and Nye have drafted a new blueprint for continued U.S. dominance of Asia. The region remains important to the U.S. because it has "half the world's population, one-third of the global economy, and growing economic, financial, technological, and political weight in the international system." Armitage and Nye are concerned that "China's growing comprehensive national power" is "aimed at shaping the strategic environment around its borders." Their greatest fear is that China will become the center of a new regional system, with economic, diplomatic, and military alliances and structures that isolate the U.S. from Asia's wealth and power.

Armitage and Nye urge the U.S. to work to insure that China becomes a "responsible stakeholder" in U.S.-Japanese dominated systems. They understand that a "bi-polar" U.S.-Chinese confrontation would alienate most Asians, so they stress the importance of U.S. Asian alliances to add an illusion of legitimacy.

Japan, Australia, South Korea, and Singapore are to constitute a "new Pacific wall", and Washington's "greatest strategic asset in the region" is described as "the close U.S.-Japan alliance" which remains "at the core of the United States' Asia strategy." To reinforce the alliance, Armitage and Nye advocate a U.S.-Japanese Free Trade Agreement to more deeply integrate the two nations and to be the foundation of a web of FTAs that will prevent China from becoming Asia's economic hub.

The expanding U.S.-Japanese alliance is to be cemented by reaffirmation of the U.S. commitment to "defend Japan" with nuclear weapons. Before Nakagawa Shoichi has his "debate over whether to

go nuclear [is] necessary", Japan will deepen its nuclear collaboration with the U.S. Tokyo is already deeply complicit in preparations for first-strike nuclear war fighting as it hosts nuclear-capable U.S. warships, provides sites for C4I bases, and helps to build and deploy "missile defenses."

Armitage and Nye know that the Japanese elite expect a bigger slice of the melon if the alliance is to be sustained. They write that "[W]hat is necessary is...a recasting of Japan's role and self perception... Japan is a country with global influence." They want Japan's military to be more "proactive." They celebrate "[t]he ongoing debate in Japan on the Constitution", and in code language urge the trashing of Article 9. They also bless Japanese "legislation that would allow for the overseas deployment of Japanese forces" to provide "greater flexibility to deploy on short notice."

Japan is among the world's top five military spenders, but Nye and Armitage want more and attempt to embarrass Japanese militarists with news that Tokyo ranks "134 in the world in terms of defense budget as a percentage of GDP." They insist that "Japan's growing regional and global responsibilities will necessitate new capabilities..." which will be paid for by tax increases and loss of essential social services.

Armitage and Nye also respect India's rising power and predict it "will rival that of China." They urge that, like the U.S. which has agreed to provide India nuclear fuel and whose warships now call at Indian Ports, Japan develop a tacit alliance with India. This, along with the restructured presence in South Korea and Australia's new role as Washington's South Pacific sheriff, they believe will complete China's encirclement.

Armitage and Nye do not see China as Washington's inevitable enemy. Ultimately, through economic and diplomatic engagement -- reinforced by military containment-- they want a U.S.-Japanese-Chinese East Asian condominium, led by Washington. They are, however, clear that the quality of U.S.-Chinese relations should never exceed those with its junior partner: Japan.

Beyond Empire and Nuclear Terrorism

Fortunately, the law of cause and effect and people's commitments to creating a better world remain powerful forces. 78 % of Japanese remain committed to Article 9, and Defense Minister Kyuma no longer holds office. Around the world, the U.S. Empire is in decline.

The struggle in the U.S. over Iraq consumes nearly all the country's political oxygen. The debate is no longer *if* the U.S. should withdraw from Iraq, *but when and how*. Despite their differences, most in Congress agree that the U.S.

has lost the Iraq war, and that if the U.S. Army is not to be shattered as an institution, phased withdrawals must begin by April. This is the beginning but not the end of the U.S. occupation. Most in Congress favor keeping 50,000 to 80,000 troops and permanent military bases in Iraq, but on October 27, with massive regional demonstrations in cities across the United States, we will send a powerful message demanding "All U.S. Troops Out Now!"

Another somewhat encouraging sign are the calls by Al Gore and Zbigniew Brzezinski for greater use of "soft power," multilateralism, and for U.S. "preeminence" instead of dominance as ways to relegitimate U.S. global power. This is not enough, but the repudiation of Bush, Cheney in last November's election may signal that we are past most dangerous period of U.S. fascist imperialism.

On the nuclear front, so far we have blocked funding for development of new nuclear weapons and expansion of the nuclear weapons production complex. And, as Niihara-sensei has observed, Washington's growing international isolation and growing pressure from popular and elite U.S. forces led the Bush Administration to change its rhetoric at the NPT Prep Com- acknowledging the "ultimate" goal of nuclear weapons abolition, even if U.S. policy has not fundamentally changed.

Peace groups across the U.S. are now organizing Hiroshima and Nagasaki commemorations. In New Hampshire and Iowa, where the first presidential caucuses and primary will be held, activists are chasing down presidential candidates, and pressing them to fully implement *all* of the NPT. They are teaching politicians and the public that the steps needed to abolish nuclear weapons are well known. With draft abolition treaties like this⁶, they are calling attention to model abolition conventions.

Here in Japan, with the Declaration for a Nuclear Free Japan, politicians working to take Japan back to the bad old days, this time with nuclear weapons, are being contained. You are also working hard to protect Article 9, and Gensuikyo's call for the Swift Abolition of Nuclear Weapons provides a vehicle to encourage activists and governments to finally free humanity from the threat of nuclear annihilation.

At the dawn of the Cold War, Albert Camus wrote, "All I ask is that, in the midst of a murderous world, we agree to reflect on murder and to make a choice."⁷ We can, as Martin Luther King, Jr. said, bend the arc of history toward freedom and peace through our actions, large and small. Having made our choices about murder, we must rededicate our life's energies to fulfilling that choice.

No More Hiroshima's. No More Nagasaki's!
No More Hibakusha! No More War!

=====

Notes:

1. Nuclear Stockpiles" The Independent, July 1, 2007
2. Joseph Gerson. *Empire and the Bomb: How the U.S. Uses Nuclear Weapons to Dominate the World*, London: Pluto Press, 2006, pp.27-38.
3. Peter Marsh. "US to lose role as world's top manufacturer by 2020," *Financial Times*, May 24, 2007.
4. Secretary of war Henry L. Stimson informed President Truman that the combination of fire bombings and nuclear attacks against Japanese cities could lead the U.S. to "get the reputation of outdoing Hitler in atrocities." The physicist Leo Szilard, who drafted the letter to President Truman that launched the Manhattan Project later stated that had the U.S. lost the war, those responsible for the atomic bombings would have been hung as war criminals. See Joseph Gerson. *Empire and the Bomb: How the U.S. Uses Nuclear Weapons to Dominate the World*, London: The Pluto Press, 2007 (or the Japanese edition published by Shinnihon Press.)
5. George P. Schultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger, Sam Nunn. "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons", *Wall Street Journal*, January 4, 2007.
6. *Securing our Survival (SOS)*, prepared by the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Cambridge, Ma., 2007
7. Albert Camus. *Neither Victims Nor Executioners*, Chicago: World Without War, 1972. p. 61.

**Hiroshi Taka
Secretary General, Japan Council against
A & H Bombs (Japan Gensuikyo)**

Chairpersons, delegates from overseas, our friends Hibakusha and nuclear sufferers,

On behalf of Japan Gensuikyo, I want to express our deep gratitude to you for your joining us in the 2007 World Conference despite your own busy schedule. I also convey our greetings of solidarity to all grassroots groups around the world who are preparing Hiroshima and Nagasaki Days actions demanding the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The 2007 World Conference is going to be an important conference in achieving a total ban on nuclear weapons.

When the NPT Review Conference in May 2000 agreed on the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, it seemed that the process to a "nuclear weapon-free world" would finally start. The Bush Administration that emerged in the following year, however, sought a new "threat" in the "crossroads of radicalism and technology" and set about a reorganization of the world order based on tremendous military power, and launched wars of preemptive attacks. Declaring that nuclear proliferation was a major enemy, it believed that their nuclear arsenals were for "deterrence", a guarantee of their security. Thus, while removing nuclear disarmament from discussions at the

United Nations and other international negotiations, it engaged in sub-critical nuclear tests, the development of new nuclear warheads, and the development and deployment of "Missile Defense" systems, which would supplement preemptive nuclear strikes.

However, that policy has led to nowhere. No nuclear weapons were reduced; no peace or security achieved; and even no proliferation was prevented. The ongoing confusion and heavy casualties in Iraq and the increasing tension on Iran are the tragic evidence that it is an error to rely on the use or threat to use force by a nuclear super power. In contrast, the progress in the Six Party Talks for the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula is an example showing that even a most complicated problem can find a way to solution if peaceful means are exhausted, relying on the support in the international opinion and reason.

At the UNGA session last year and again in the discussion at the NPT PrepCom in Vienna in spring this year, many governments of the Non-Aligned Movement and New Agenda Coalition and even some members of the major military alliances called for the implementation of the agreements reached by the previous Review Conferences. Many pointed out that the major problem today lay in the posture of the nuclear weapons states, above all of the nuclear superpowers that virtually monopolize the world's nuclear arsenals.

Adding to this, former high officials of nuclear powers who once engaged in diplomacy or military policy made statements calling on their governments "to turn the goal of a world without nuclear weapons into a joint enterprise". This is also a new development.

So that the 2010 NPT Review Conference can start the process of abolishing nuclear weapons without repeating the failure of the last Conference, civil society and governments must work together to build up strong public opinion in support of the total abolition.

While emphasizing that the peace movements must launch a new round of abolitionist campaigns in each country, I want to express our hope that all the governments that stand for a nuclear weapon-free world, including nuclear weapon states governments, will take the lead in producing a UNGA resolution defining that a total ban on nuclear weapons is an urgent and vital task for the UN and urging the start of a concrete process of consultations to achieve this task.

The abolition of nuclear weapons requires both internationally coordinated action and sustained efforts at the national level to establish a non-nuclear policy in each country. Japan has a Constitution that renounces war and war potential, based on the critical review of Japan's past aggression. It also has the national principle

called the "Three Non-Nuclear Principles" of not possessing, not manufacturing and not allowing the bringing-in of nuclear weapons. The Japanese Government, therefore, does have an obligation to implement them and promote the elimination of nuclear weapons.

What Japan is doing in reality is to follow the US in its pursuit of the "Post-Cold War" hegemony. It is hosting large numbers of US bases and facilities operating as forward bases of the preemptive attack strategy: It condones the operation of the US nuclear strategy, and even urges nuclear blackmailing. This is the reality developed under the "nuclear umbrella": It is further moving to scrap Article 9 of the Constitution. Combined with nationalism, seen in its behavior to conceal and even try to justify past war crimes, Japan's policy is causing strong concern both at home and overseas.

However, these policies are not really widely supported. Most opinion polls conducted after North Korea's nuclear testing showed that around 80% of the answers still supported the three non-nuclear principles. The strong protest of the people against the statement of defense minister Kyuma Fumio that the "A-bombing was unavoidable" and his subsequent resignation, and the heavy setback of the LDP-Komeito coalition in the recent upper house elections were another proof of it. As to the Constitution, the media campaign, such as "the current Constitution is outdated", has had some effect on the public opinion. But where Article 9 comes in, the majority of the people assert that it should not be revised. This tendency is more conspicuous among the young generations.

In April this year, Japan Gensuikyo and the Association for a Non-Nuclear Government, together with leaders of a wide-range of peace organizations, launched a campaign for a "Nuclear Weapon-Free Japan Declaration." It is to urge the Japanese Government to declare at the National Diet and at the UN General Assembly that Japan's position is to promote the elimination of nuclear weapons and to abide by the three non-nuclear principles. For three months since then, the support has spread nationwide. It has been endorsed by 207 governors and mayors, and the chairpersons of 149 local assemblies. Large numbers of municipal councils have passed a resolution urging the national government to issue a nuclear weapon-free declaration.

I want to call on the Japanese participants to fully develop this campaign in September, when all local assemblies will meet, so that Japan will join New Agenda Coalition and Non-Aligned Movement in their effort for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Last year, shortly after the World Conference ended, our friend Abdel-Moneim told us that "if

Japan initiates, the world follows. But if Japan stops, then the world stops. Though unfortunate, the atom bombs were dropped on Japan”.

The Japanese movement has a special responsibility to make known to the world the damage of the A-bombings in its full depth and dimensions and call for actions for a world free of nuclear weapons. As part of this effort, we will continue collecting signatures in support of the call for “Swift Abolition of Nuclear Weapons.” We work with the Hibakusha, helping their mission to spread their testimonies to the world. In this respect, I heartily thank the Egyptian Government for its support of the project to open an A-bomb photo exhibition in Cairo and Alexandria this coming October.

In 2008, there will be the 2nd PrepCom of the NPT Review Conference, followed by an Article 9 International Conference in May, then by the G8 Summit in June in Hokkaido, and then by the 2008 World Conference. We should make each event an opportunity to have our voices heard by international politics. Our annual peace march starts on May 6 next year and walks in 11 courses nationwide towards Hiroshima or Nagasaki. My suggestion is to make the march in all the courses more open both for citizens and international participation.

I hope for your input and lively discussion for plans and actions that will render this year’s conference truly meaningful. Thank you.

Statements:

Horie Yuri Executive Committee Member, Women’s International Democratic Federation (WIDF)/ President, Japan Federation of Women’s Organizations (FUDANREN)

On behalf of the Women’s International Democratic Federation (WIDF), I extend to this World Conference the warmest greetings of solidarity from WIDF President Marcia Campos of Brazil and from women around the world banding together under the banner of the WIDF. The WIDF is an NGO that unites women’s organizations in about a hundred countries and that has consultative status with the United Nations. It was founded in Paris in December 1945 with the aim of fighting for a lasting peace, for the well-being of children, and for the rights of women in opposition to fascism and war. In Japan, my organization, the Japan Federation of Women’s Organizations (FUDANREN) is a member of the WIDF. FUDANREN is composed of the New Japan Women’s Association, women’s sections of the National Confederation of Trade Unions and

of the National Federation of Traders and Producers Organizations, and other women’s groups. I, therefore, bring you greetings of solidarity from women’s organizations throughout Japan.

I would like to respond to the presentations already made by informing you of WIDF’s latest activities. Last April, WIDF held its Fourteenth Congress in Caracas, the national capital of Venezuela. A thousand delegates from about a hundred countries took part in the Congress, including representatives of women’s and peace organizations in Latin America and the United States, as well as of trade unions of different countries. From Japan, Shibata Masako, Vice President of the National Confederation of Trade Unions, who is chairing the session today, and I attended the Congress.

In the discussion on peace, delegates took up the abolition of nuclear weapons as one vital task for achieving a peaceful and just world, which was the theme of the Congress, along with other tasks such as the withdrawal of occupying forces from Iraq, the liberation of Palestine, and the removal of foreign military bases.

Here, I have brought some of the signatures in support of the appeal for the Swift Abolition of Nuclear Weapons. We collected them during the WIDF Congress from women from different countries. Apart from these signatures, delegates of Sweden and Iceland gave me signatures that they had gathered in their own countries before they came to the Congress. They had translated the appeal into their own languages, had made their own forms, and had collected 1260 signatures in Sweden and 500 in Iceland. Through FUDANREN, a Japanese member of WIDF, and FUDANREN’s affiliates, the calls and concrete action proposals for the abolition of nuclear weapons made by the World Conference against Atomic & Hydrogen Bombs have reached women’s organizations throughout the world. Women have welcomed the proposals and started to take action. I join those who have already spoken in this session in calling for the continuation of the signature campaign for the Swift Abolition of Nuclear Weapons. For WIDF, the work has only just begun.

The WIDF Congress on its final day adopted the Caracas Declaration, which called for a peaceful world free of nuclear weapons and war, for gender equality, and for the advancement of women.

As part of the activities to implement the Caracas Declaration, WIDF is now producing a video entitled Women of the World. The WIDF office in Brazil asked me for a message from Japan for the video as a means to promote actions among WIDF members for nuclear abolition, so I hastily recorded my message and sent it with a set of

A-bomb photo panels to Brazil. They especially wanted me to speak in detail about the realities of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

To conclude, I express the resolve of FUDANREN, as a Japanese member of WIDF, to continue doing its utmost so that the international women's movement will work for a peaceful and just world and will make further efforts for advancing the movement for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

Ogata Yasuo
Member, Committee of Chairpersons,
Organizing Committee of World Conference/
Vice-Chairperson, Executive Committee,
Japanese Communist Party

Japan's House of Councilors election held five days ago saw an historic defeat for the ruling parties, the Liberal Democratic Party and the Komei Party. This was a clear-cut judgment the people passed on the policies of the Abe cabinet formed 10 months ago, policies which found expression in the exacerbated poverty and the widening gap between rich and poor as well as in justification of the past war of aggression. The crushing defeat of the LDP, which placed constitutional revision at the top of its election platform, has dealt a heavy blow to the pro-Yasukuni forces that form the backbone of the Abe cabinet calling for Japan's "departure from the postwar regime." This at the same time means that a new political process has started to seek a political course as an alternative to the Abe government. We have renewed our resolve to make further efforts as demanded by the current situation.

As regards peace, the abnormal character of the Abe cabinet was clearly demonstrated by Defense Minister Kyuma's incredible remark made just before the election campaign started, that the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki "couldn't be helped." Kyuma Fumio, the then Defense Minister, on June 30 said in his speech at Reitaku University, "Indeed countless numbers of people suffered disasters, but my understanding is that it ended the war and that it couldn't be helped."

Sixty-two years ago, the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki destroyed the two cities and killed more than 200,000 people indiscriminately, including children and old people. Many people who were burned by heat rays and exposed to radiation are still suffering. The excuse that the bombing brought a speedy ending to the war and saved many lives does not hold water. The U.S. military leadership at the time had an understanding that the atomic bombing was unnecessary for bringing Japan to capitulation,

as it had lost most of its warfare capability. Dwight Eisenhower was one of those who opposed the atomic bombing, which was clearly recorded in his memoirs.

Justifying the atomic bombing with the words "it couldn't be helped" not only further violates the victims, but also leads to justification of a third use of nuclear weapons. The crux of the matter is that nuclear weapons are against humanity, and that they should be eliminated. Included in the UN General Assembly's first resolution in 1946 was "the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons," which shows the international community's determination postwar.

What we can read from Mr. Kyuma's remarks is the Abe government's position of relying on the U.S. "nuclear umbrella," abstaining on resolutions on a ban on the use of nuclear weapons, and turning its back on the swift abolition of nuclear weapons. During last year's UN General Assembly sessions, the Japanese government abstained on both the Malaysia-proposed resolution of "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons" and the India-proposed "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons." It also abstained from voting on the elimination of nuclear weapons which Myanmar presented on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. They say "it is yet too early" to demand the start of negotiations for a treaty on elimination of nuclear weapons and prohibition of their use, and that any treaty must be one based on reality with a step-by-step approach.

The World Conference against A and H Bombs, succeeding to the determination of the postwar international community, has now developed into a movement embracing national governments, municipalities and citizens' movements, with the common goal of the abolition of nuclear weapons. This has taken shape since representatives of the governments which made great efforts in the 2000 NPT Review Conference participated in that year's World Conference.

At the 2000 NPT Review Conference, even the nuclear weapon states agreed to an "unequivocal undertaking" to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. But the Bush administration, with its "preemptive attack strategy" backed by its enormous nuclear arsenal, revoked its promise. It has developed a military strategy for integrated use of nuclear and conventional weapons, and is carrying forward a nuclear weapon development plan to secure for dozens of years ahead a large number of nuclear weapons with a lower threshold for their use.

Meanwhile, the Iraq quagmire has exposed the failure of the "preemptive attack strategy" for all to see. The U.S. policy to prevent "nuclear

proliferation” for others while clinging to its own nuclear weapons, aggravated the situation about the nuclear program in North Korea and Iran. Mirroring these realities, earlier this year, former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger and three other former U.S. Government and Congressional leaders published an appeal in the Wall Street Journal, stating, “we endorse setting the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and working energetically on the actions required to achieve that goal.” Last June in a speech in Washington, the then British Foreign Secretary Margaret Beckett, referring to their appeal, expressed her sense of urgency over the NPT regime being threatened by the nuclear weapon states’ neglect of disarmament efforts, and called for strengthened international activity toward the elimination of nuclear weapons.

In the face of the nuclear tests by North Korea last October, the international community centered around the United Nations has unanimously made efforts towards denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula. The road to an actual settlement will be full of twists and turns, but there is now a possibility to resolve this question through the six-party talks. We seek the swift elimination of nuclear weapons on a global scale, and therefore, we criticize the NPT regime that allows a monopoly of nuclear weapons by the few, and at the same time shall never tolerate the emergence of new nuclear weapon states under any pretexts.

In order to resolve the North Korean nuclear issue, whether to implement the accord of the 2000 NPT Review Conference is once again called into question, the accord which includes 13-point “practical measures,” including “unequivocal undertaking” to eliminate nuclear arsenals by nuclear weapon states, as well as a commitment to security assurances for non-nuclear weapon states parties to the NPT. In late April this year, the U.S. government presented a document to the preparatory committee for the 2010 NPT Review Conference, and insisted that the 13-point “practical measures” are inappropriate in the present international circumstances. On the basis of the achievements in the 2000 NPT Review Conference, we should step up activities to demand the elimination of nuclear weapons, with a view to the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, which the Abe cabinet shows enmity towards, is an irreplaceable world treasure which comes at the expense of the enormous sacrifice of the peoples in Asia and Japan. An attempt to adversely revise this Constitution goes against the friendship with Asian nations and to bring back the militarism we experienced in the past. We must not simply accept this attempt. Let’s carry out our responsibility as the only atomic-bombed country and energetically develop our struggle against

nuclear weapons and for peace.

John Hallam
People for Nuclear Disarmament/ Friends of the Earth
Australia

Nuclear Weapons - The Forgotten Apocalypse

Nuclear Weapons have become for most people outside Japan, a kind of forgotten apocalypse, a nightmare of the 1980s when hundreds of thousands of people marched in the streets believing - more correctly it turns out, than anyone knew - that the world could end any day. It almost did on between a dozen, and half a dozen occasions. There were quite a number of events, only revealed much later in the 1990s when we thought it was all over, when for terrifying minutes, the fate of the world rested in the hands of stressed military personnel or drunken presidents with bleeping nuclear briefcases. We owe our very existence to Russian Colonel Stan Petrov, an anonymous US minuteman commander and an unknown assistant to President Boris Yeltsin.

The work of climate - modelling scientists, many of whom later contributed to the issue of global warming, showed us that the injection of smoke into the upper atmosphere from the burning of hundreds of large cities would bring sub-zero temperatures and darkness to the jungles of the Amazon, thereby bringing about the disappearance of most land-based living species. More recent work by some of the same scientists has reinforced these grim conclusions. A 'nuclear winter' would be the result of as little as 100 megaton- sized warheads used for the destruction of major cities. Yet even now, the US and Russia maintain thousands of warheads on hair-trigger 'launch on warning' status.

According to a 9 June 1988 address to the UN General Assembly by Indian Prime Minister Rajeev Gandhi: "Nuclear war will not mean the death of a hundred million people. Or even a thousand million. It will mean the extinction of four thousand million: the end of life as we know it on our planet earth."

Even Ronald Reagan, whom nuclear disarmament activists like me loved to hate, thought nuclear weapons should be abolished: Reagan called for the abolition of "all nuclear weapons," which he considered to be "totally irrational, totally inhumane, good for nothing but killing, possibly destructive of life on earth and civilisation." Mikhail Gorbachev shared this vision, which had also been expressed by previous American presidents.

With the collapse of the Soviet Union, we thought that the prospect of global annihilation

had receded. In actuality, the so-called 'de-targeting' of US and Russian missiles added just seconds to launch time, making the probability of an accidental apocalypse barely lower, and in 1995 there was a frighteningly close call when Russian perimeter radar mistook a Norwegian weather research rocket for a US first strike aimed at taking out the Kremlin.

Now, though the situation cannot be understood as apocalyptically dangerous as it was in the 1980s, (when there were up to 15,000 warheads on LoW status) the danger signs are there for all to read, yet we are not reading them. The mindset is that nuclear annihilation is a nightmare whose time has passed, a forgotten or half-forgotten nightmare of the 80s. We do not want to revisit it.

We are fooling ourselves if we think this. Action needs to be taken by governments as a matter of the highest priority to fulfil the terms of article VI of the NPT, and bring about the total and unequivocal elimination of all nuclear weapons.

In recent times, there have been strong calls for action from Kofi Annan, Mohamed El Baradei, Ban Ki-Moon, the Rome Conference of Nobel Peace-Prize Winners (chaired by Mikhail Gorbachev), and the 18 nobels who advise *the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* on the position of the hands of the 'doomsday clock' have moved the hands of the clock from seven minutes to midnight to five minutes to midnight. Not quite the two minutes to midnight of the 1950s, or the three minutes of the 80s (when arguably it should have been much much closer), but a powerful reminder that we are heading in the wrong direction. More recent warnings have been issued by the Pugwash Conference of Scientists and by Gorbachev.

All of these groups also called as a first step, as did the 1996 Canberra Commission and the 2006 Blix Commission, for nuclear weapons to be taken off Launch on Warning status to avoid an accidental apocalypse.

The need to abolish nuclear weapons before nuclear weapons abolish us is as clear as it's ever been. It has been articulated at the very highest levels, yet public concern, and therefore political priorities, are not nearly as much focussed on it as they should be. Kofi Annan's pronouncements and those of the various groups of Nobels should have had front-page coverage yet in Australia they were barely noticed. Many anti-nuclear weapons organisations (though not all) consist of aging activists and aging memberships - people who were young and who demonstrated in the 60s, 70s and 80s and who are now part of the 'older generation'. The young are permanently grafted to various bits of technology, but on the whole they are not using these for nuclear disarmament activism.

The paradox that bedevils anti-nuclear weapons

activism is that, as long as we visibly teeter on the brink of annihilation, people will be concerned. Once we step back a centimetre from the brink, the public concern goes away. And if we teeter for too long people get used to that also, and conclude that there is really no danger or that they can live with it. How many times can we spin the Russian (or US) roulette barrel until we conclude that there is no bullet - and the next shot kills us, or maybe not.

At the level of the UN General Assembly, the will of the entire planet for the elimination of nuclear weapons is clear. The electronic voting board of the General Assembly time after time shows massive, overwhelming, majorities of nations voting for resolutions such as the NAM resolution on nuclear disarmament (which attracts the support of 80% of all governments) and the Renewed Determination Toward the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons put up by Japan and Australia, which is supported by all but 4-5 states out of 191, including, Alas! the US. Yet the will of about 95-99% of the planet for the elimination of the weapons that can destroy everything could not be more clear.

We must call on governments to take immediate steps via whatever mechanisms are effective, and to create new mechanisms if the existing ones do not work, to bring about the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and for that purpose to bring into force a nuclear weapons convention.

As preliminary steps toward that, as per Canberra 1996, Blix 2006, Rome Declaration 2007, Bulletin 2007, Annan 2006, and three General Assembly resolutions every year, nuclear weapons in the US and Russia and also in India and Pakistan, must be taken off hair-trigger alert and/or 'launch on warning' status so that an accidental or deliberate apocalypse cannot destroy entire regions or the world as a whole.

Negotiations presently deadlocked in forums such as the Committee on Disarmament, that would take the world down the road to eliminate nuclear weapons must be expedited by whatever steps are necessary, including changes in decision-making practices. One nation - even the most powerful - should not be able to thwart the will of the rest of the world.

Successful negotiations for a fissile materials cut-off treaty, for negative security assurances whereby non-nuclear-armed states will never be nuclear targets, for nuclear disarmament, and for the peaceful use of outer space must take place, and the barriers to that success must be removed. The barriers to the entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) must be overcome and the treaty must enter into force. Creative diplomatic measures should be taken to achieve that entry into force.

Governments, especially those of the US and Russia but also Israel, India, Pakistan, France, China, the UK and the DPRK must understand that as long as they cling to nuclear weapons others will wish to acquire them, and that as long as effective disarmament does not take place, the pressure for nuclear proliferation will be impossible to overcome.

A Nuclear Weapons Convention, as per the text to be submitted to the next General Assembly by Costa Rica, and already submitted as a working paper to the NPT PrepCom must be concluded and must enter into force.

Public opinion, in especially the US and Russia, must once more take up the issue of nuclear weapons, and must demand their governments recognise the will of the entire planet, and their legal obligation under the NPT, to bring about the elimination of the only means whereby the world or large parts of it can end in less than an hour.

Dao Ngoc Ninh
Vietnam Peace Committee
Vietnam

Distinguished members of the Chair, Fellow participants and friends, Ladies and Gentlemen,

This is the 1st time I attend the World Conference against A & H Bombs, and I have great pleasure to meet new friends. Allow me to convey to all of you the warmest greetings and best wishes of the Vietnam Peace Committee and the Vietnamese people working for peace and friendship among nations.

Allow me also to extend my heartfelt congratulations to the Japan Council against A & H Bombs (Gensuikyo) on its 52nd founding anniversary, and to thank it and other Japanese friends for their hospitality and their great efforts in holding this event.

Sixty-two years have passed by since 1945, the year that the two cities of Japan, Hiroshima and Nagasaki were destroyed by nuclear bombs and, to date, a world without nuclear weapons still remains a pledge instead of a reality. The nuclear arsenal keeps growing, and, under the pretext of coping with the danger of weapons of mass destruction, the United States and its allies have rendered the nuclear threat ever more serious with their concept of “usable” nuclear weapons and their doctrine of “preemptive attack”.

The United States is the first country to have used weapons of mass destruction – 62 years ago with the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, then with the spraying of the toxic chemical Agent Orange/dioxin during its war in Vietnam. It vividly reminds us all that there remain numerous Japanese Hibakushas who need A-bomb disease recognition, relief and

compensation; just like there remain numerous Vietnamese victims of Agent Orange/dioxin who also need relief and compensation.

Over 30 years have passed since the end of the American War in Vietnam. Yet, many Americans, Australians, New Zealanders, South Koreans... most of them as war veterans, and a much greater number of Vietnamese are still suffering from the mortal effects of Agent Orange/dioxin and other substances produced by U.S. chemical companies and used by U.S. forces during the Vietnam war. Millions of Vietnamese exposed to Agent Orange/dioxin are now coping with fatal diseases, tens of thousands of them have died in tremendous pain, hundreds of thousands of children have been born with birth-defects and disabilities, and countless women have been deprived of the right to be mothers.

Using chemical weapons or nuclear weapons is the use of mass destruction weapons. It is clear that the atomization of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, just like the chemical victimization of Vietnamese, are suffering not only of the past but also of the present. And while trying our best to lessen these sufferings, we should strive to ensure that they shall not be repeated in the future. We demand that justice and compensation be done for all the victims of nuclear bombings and “peaceful” explosions, as well as those of Agent Orange/dioxin in Vietnam.

We should also make this Conference a turning point in the world-wide movement for the abolition of nuclear weapons and all kinds of weapons of mass destruction, now that 52 years have passed since the first World Conference against A & H Bombs, and that relentless efforts have deployed by Gensuikyo and other peace forces in Japan and elsewhere.

I believe that by working together tirelessly and concertedly, we will be able to achieve our above-mentioned goal, and that a conference of this kind is a great source of encouragement to us all.

No more Hiroshima! No more Nagasaki! No more Agent Orange/dioxin!

Justice for Hibakusha! Justice for Vietnamese Agent Orange/dioxin victims!

Thank you for your attention.

Ejimole Fidel Onwuekwe
World Youth Peace Organization
Nigeria

World Youth Peace Organization Solidarity
Support for the Hibakusha and for Immediate
Abolition of Atomic & Hydrogen Bombs, Giving
Way for 21st Century Nuclear-Free, Peaceful and
Just World

Your Excellencies, Honourable Ministers of Public Sectors,
Managing Directors of Private Sectors,
The chief Host of the Conference,
Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a blessing and great privilege for us to be here celebrating the 62nd anniversary of the Campaign on Abolition of the Atomic and Hydrogen bombs 2007. Also, we rejoice for a remarkable history of victory for the Hibakushas recognition of their claims of poor medical health caused by the spread of the invisible radiations from the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings of 1945 Second World War. The decades of their struggles for the truth and justice are now proven and revealed to the outside world.

Another spectacular and successful historic event was the North Korea's shutting down and giving up its nuclear weapon production; Middle East crisis between Israel and Palestine is yielding a fruitful and peaceful resolution. The State of Israel willingly, ready to reach out for a brotherly relationship with its neighbour Palestine. Israel with caring attitude desires in lifting its economic embargo; providing humanitarian services; releasing 250 prisoners; paying 600 million dollar freezing money back to the Palestinian government. All these gracious offerings to the administration of President H. F. Mahmoud Abbas of Palestine are giving way for reconciliation and peace between the two states. Though, Iraq crisis seems somehow critical, but there are underlying hopes for peace to prevail in that war torn nation.

Since the inception of this conference decades ago, world leaders are knowledgeable about the dangers and implications of hurling nuclear weapons. The organization is humbly asking for their immediate transformation of adequate transparency, good governance and accountability of their stewardship in making our world a safe, free and just world.

The Universal Creator is the architect of peace, knowing Him is the beginning of a man's wisdom and knowledge. In the absence of His presence, peace could not be manifested as a foundation of life, a symbol of joy and happiness in every home and society. If the nuclear weapon proliferation and deployment are not halted as soon as possible, the international community faces impending doom of destruction. The byproducts of these materials are illegally transported and sold out to the men of the underworld in fueling terrorism.

Hibakushas exist where dirty bombs were used during civil or invasion wars on humans. Africa is not exempted from the unforgettable experience of the hibakushas. Wars in Africa are being influenced, financed, and managed by foreign powers, who succeeded in dumping their sophisticated weapons and bombs for money in supporting or crushing the so-called rebels. In the

history of mankind, no war can be classified as a happy ended war. The Nigeria/Biafra civil war in 1967 that ended after thirty months of fighting was never a happy ended war but a nightmare experience to the people on both sides of the war zone. Some years later, people from the defunct Biafra started experiencing different types of signs and symptoms of sorts of cancers.

We will continue voicing out our concern on the total abolition of all nuclear types on behalf of our families globally. Our land surfaces, crops, water, in fact all the basic necessity for sustainable life are contaminated or polluted with the waste material byproducts from the nuclear plants. United Nations, as the monumental body representing all nations fell short of its glory by not being recognized and respected by some world leaders. As a family head, UN should take course of our plight in this matter on the total abolition of these dangerous weapons into serious consideration before we are consumed and destroyed.

North Korea is welcomed back into our global family circle of nations that believe in "21st Century Nuclear Free, Peaceful and Just World." The U-Turn demonstrated by North Korea was a kind gesture of Universal Oneness. Building and managing nuclear plants are expensive. Funds for such programmes should be invested into our children's education trust fund and welfare. Isolating and placing economic embargo to defiant states on the issue of abandoning dangerous nuclear programmes are not for the interest of the common man, but undermine his living standard, when in fact, he is already living below poverty line. A continuous global sensitization on the dangers of nuclear building and deployment to the global community could bring successful abolition of the deadly weapons and also save our succeeding generation from terror threats.

Love and peace have no boundaries in a perfect built nuclear free world. With our new change of hearts and attitudes, we can express our sincere love and caring for one another regardless of who they are, and where they are coming from. The simplicity of truth is that we must take one step at a time, examine our human conscience of malicious acts toward others. By so doing, we can amend our ways and move toward pardoning past hurts and inflictions. Deep-rooted animosity and hoarding of grievances against nations, influence global hate crimes, fundamentalism and terrorism which the world is facing today. Reaching out to brother nations, we can love the unlovable; be kind to the unkind; forgive the unforgivable; and reconcile with those that crushed our spirits. By accomplishing all these, our overflow of joy and happiness welled up in rich generosity for one another.

No more Hiroshima; No more Nagasaki; No

more Middle East, Arab and Africa wars; No more Hibakushas!!! Arigato, Merci buoque, Gracias, Thank you all and God bless!!!

**Rick Tingling-Clemmons
Hiroshima-Nagasaki Peace Committee of
National Capital Area
USA**

Greetings first to the Hibakusha, my Japanese hosts, peace-loving friends from around the world, and special guests. I am Rick-Tingling-Clemmons, a 64-year-old Vietnam era US Air Force veteran who served at Yokota air base and spent 5 happy years in Japan becoming a man and an anti-war activist.

This is a wonderful time to be here and alive. Since my last visit at last year's conference I had another heart attack and quadruple heart bypass surgery.

We are given an opportunity to witness the same level of stupidity that was witnessed 62 years ago, when my country, the United States of America dropped first an Atomic bomb on Hiroshima followed by a Hydrogen bomb on Nagasaki. Imperialism as the so-called "free world" method of global economy is the main cause of war around the world. Whether on the side of taking - wars of aggression - or on the side of resisting the taking - sometimes called wars of liberation - the key word is war.

Taking this movement to its natural step and taking a stance against war, defined as "a condition of active antagonism or contention;" realizing/recognizing that war is antithetical to a positive production of peace, happiness, freedom, food, health care, housing, safety; freedom of movement, and stuff we need for learning, human growth and development. It should be easy to see that you can eliminate war by giving people what they need. This understanding is not new... it is as old as humankind. It is the basis of human progress and development.

Yet, it only happens when those that produce everything - the working class - make the decisions. It is only the rich who have nothing tangible to do with production, really, who decide to destroy that which they did not produce. Ask yourself, "When have workers declared war?" - unless it was to liberate themselves. The key to a better productive world is one without war. We must help all people to survive and thrive. The A & H bombs were just the tools; racism and other negative isms are the justification and motivation the rich use. This race, OUR human race, the only race, has created some bad but mostly great ideas, civilizations, cultures and things. This world without war (peace) will help us continue on this road to progress. It is the hate and wantonly

destructive ideas that must be eliminated.

I live in a country that my ancestors played a major role in creating - without pay. Fortunately, at least 5 generations of my family have lived above the U.S. poverty level, excelling in education, entrepreneurship, sports, and the arts under duress, racism and social discrimination. In a country where today 50% cannot read or write the language they speak, high school dropout rates are among the highest in the industrial world, where 40-50 million do not have access to health care, where infant mortality is comparable to the non-industrial nations, where homicides and suicides are among the highest in the world, where unemployment among so-called minorities is the highest in the industrial world, corruption in the political arena is among the highest, where CEO's are paid the most and unlike in most countries, people are afraid of the government, not the government afraid of its people; where hundreds of billions of the treasury is spent monthly on a war that was based on a lie, totally devastating Iraq's infrastructure, killing upwards of 800,000 of its people along with 3.5 thousand Americans, injuring over 16,000. This is just one front, there are many. This war has left most major cities with millions in unfunded mandates and unable to get government assistance against major urban blight and strife, where over 2 million are incarcerated, mostly so-called minorities, where AIDS is highest among industrial nations, and the list goes on.

"Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere," stated Martin Luther King, Jr. The U.S. government is less secure today than before 9/11. As an American Patriot, I'm distraught that my government - not its people - has brought so much devastation and harm to so many of our world's people for hundreds of years. What is worse, this new - to me - view of America started after I had joined the U.S. Air Force and was stationed in Japan, from 1963 - 1968. In spite of this newfound knowledge, I loved my country, and I embarked on a process to make America a better place to live for all people in the U.S. and around the world; a place where public education was first experienced, where the eight-hour work day was first enacted, where the end to child labor and one of the first forms of people's representative government was witnessed; public schools, housing, hospitals, health centers, day care, social security; public libraries, transportation, parks, recreation, museums; and public works, just to name a few of the areas where America has led the world. All of these initiatives were promoted and developed by America's people, its working class.

There have been some good rich people, but almost all of the bad in history was done by the rich. This is not just an American phenomenon; it is worldwide. Who are the decision makers in

the world? And, why? This planet really belongs to all of us and it is up to us to save it for our posterity.

War has caused more death and destruction than all the diseases and natural disasters put together to date. Global murder (war) and global warming are two of the worldwide concerns threatening life on earth. We need a worldwide response to these threats. That could and must be us. We have several decades working for peace and thousands of friends around the world exposing the anti-human and destructive nature of war and its tools, the A & H bombs, (only dropped in history on my friends by the United States of America government). We need a response to the people who need war for whatever the reason. War must be stopped, like global warming. We have such a worldwide movement and organization, one that comes together every year in Japan. But, I heard here last year, from some of our friends of other countries, the same kind of rationalization that I hear from leaders in my own country justifying the use of nuclear power as "peaceful uses" and know about other countries threatening to follow in the same path. Nuclear power, from mining to the bomb, is dangerous. And, it can only be used at great cost – to our environment, to our health, to our security, and to our civilization as we know it.

No More Hiroshimas!! No More Nagasakis!!

Michele Tingling-Clemmons
Hiroshima-Nagasaki Peace Committee
USA

**“Let there be peace on earth, and let it begin
with me...”**

In the name of the Hiroshima-Nagasaki Peace Committee in Washington, DC, I offer greetings to our gracious hosts, to the Hibakusha and all the peace-loving people here from across Japan and all other nations. I am a health worker, wife, mother of eight, a grandmother, a daughter, a peace and justice activist who believes that none of us is free until all of us are free – of nuclear weapons, of nuclear power, of exploitation, of poverty, of pain, of injustice.

Our delegation includes my husband Rick and our youngest son Langston, as well as our comrade Malachy; and while I cannot speak for them, I do know, as do many of you here, along with my sisters and brothers in the National Welfare Rights Union, in our local Civic Association, and numerous other organizations, that until we are all free of the pains of ill health, of poverty, of homelessness, of hunger, of miseducation and ignorance, of illiteracy, of joblessness; until we are free of all the many forms of exploitation that are

heaped on our class – the working class – by the rich; until we have justice, we cannot have true peace.

Who of us can sit by peacefully when our children, our elders, our neighbors and our loved ones are being denied the very sustenance they need to survive and thrive? Who? None of us here nor many other places. But, the rich not only can, they do! They dine and sleep well while the government they run bomb innocent, helpless Iraqis, just as they did when they had that same government drop the Atomic and Hydrogen bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. When the U.S. government, run by George W. Bush invaded Iraq, I was here, demonstrating with students in the streets of Kyoto, and with comrades from other nations like South Africa, Liberia and New Zealand who I joined as a human billboard to protest the launching of yet another unjust war of exploitation against another nation of brown people for the sole purpose of stealing their oil and punishing their leader for daring to announce his intention to begin accepting only Euros for the purchase of his nation's oil. We had come to the World Water Forum to protest the injustice of rich corporations commodifying water in the face of millions living, sickening and dying for lack of potable drinking water, while these same corporations claimed a vital resource to which they had no legitimate right, to place it in non-renewable containers that were polluting the land and water, the very source of their ill-gained wealth. This experience only confirmed my understanding of the Japanese people as partners, as comrades in the struggle for justice, which is imperative in our quest for peace.

When our son Toussaint came here in 2002, an 18-year-old representing our committee as its first youth representative, the theme of his remarks was "No Justice, No Peace!" That is a theme that I also am committed to, and want to broaden here today. In my trip to Kyoto in 2003; to China in 1995 to the 4th World Conference on Women; on an occupational health study tour to Sweden in 1979; and all over the United States working to end nuclear proliferation, hunger, homelessness, environmental injustice, injustice in health care and joblessness since for over 25 years, I have met and worked with people who wanted to improve their conditions and those of their neighbors and communities. I have also learned that it is the people who create, build and make everything, who want to share – only to find that it is government, especially the U.S. government that is run by the rich – that not only does not want to share what we have, it wants to take what other people have created, built, made, no matter what the cost to our class, the working class. In other words, while we want to end suffering and exploitation, we are fighting our own government

that is busy stealing our common wealth, and using our young people through its military to steal the wealth of others in the world.

That led me to ask, do they have that right? Do the rich, who have not worked, or created, or made our wealth, have the right to just steal it from our children, from us, from the world? And the answer is a resounding NO! They do NOT have that right, any more than they had the right to kidnap and enslave my ancestors and force them to build the wealthy nation that is the United States; than they had the right to steal this land from our native brothers and sisters, claiming it for their own; than they have the right to label their descendants “illegal immigrants” and deny their culpability in destabilizing their economies for the profits of greed as their capital flows without restraint while the human victims are labeled criminals if they try to survive; than they had the right to launch their most recent war of aggression against a nation to punish its leader – one of their rich friends – by making its people suffer.

I am proud to be the product of five generations of teachers – even coming through their history of enslavement – and of Jamaican immigrants, who became a family that produced my late father – a Civil Court judge – and my mother, a retired public school teacher. I even have a brother who is a Supreme Court Judge in New York City. With my husband Rick, the child of a football player and opera singer, I have children who are teachers, and three still in college, studying to become a lawyer, a teacher and a doctor. It is with them in mind that I reject the suggestions I heard here last year contemplating the peaceful uses of nuclear power. I know, from my years protesting the disaster and denial at Three-Mile Island and working for renewable energy and conservation, that nuclear power – from mining to the bomb – kills. It had a 100 percent mortality rate among the Navaho miners in the US, and is still devastating our people today. Nuclear power, an expensive way to boil water, devastates our environment, compromises our security, and is a rationalization for its uses in war. We MUST end the proliferation of nuclear weapons; of all weapons of war; of the unjustifiable veneration of the rich – we must stop allowing those who have seized control of our commonwealth to dictate our lives and the futures of our children. And, the best way to do this is to support people having the things they need, the control of their land, their natural resources, their markets, their labor, true justice – and thereby ending the need or interests in wars of exploitation, aggression, or liberation. We have the recipe for peace – we just need to get cooking! Those of us who want peace must commit to work for justice. Please join me. No More Hiroshimas! No More Nagasakis! No More Hibakusha! No More War!

Statement Submitted to the World Conference:

Saito Kazuyoshi International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL)

For the swift abolition of nuclear weapons: Sixty-two years have passed since the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It's been 61 years since the adoption of the UN General Assembly resolution in 1946 on the elimination of atomic weaponry from national arsenals, and 46 years since the adoption of the UN Security Council resolution in 1961 on the security assurance to non-nuclear weapons states. It is incumbent upon this year's World Conference against A & H Bombs to take important steps toward the swift abolition of nuclear weapons from the world.

As stipulated in the preamble to the UN Charter, humanity experienced untold sorrow twice in the two world wars, and it was at the very end of that period when the atomic bombs were dropped.

Japan renounced war as a sovereign right of the nation as well as possession of any military means to that end in Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution because of its responsibility and apologies for having waged a war of aggression.

However, mankind has not abolished nuclear weapons but has gone on to contravene the UN resolution and began a nuclear arms race, which we see no end to. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was concluded in 1968, banning the possession of nuclear weapons by countries other than the already declared 5 nuclear weapons states: the US, the Soviet Union (now Russia), the UK, France and China.

This treaty has not been fully observed. India and Pakistan went nuclear in 1998, and it is widely recognized as an open secret that Israel possesses nuclear weapons. In addition, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) declared its withdrawal from the treaty and is suspected of possessing nuclear weapons. In the six-party negotiations with China, the US, Russia, Japan and the Republic of Korea, North Korea is requested to abandon its nuclear program. Though it has made certain steps toward that end, it is too early to predict any optimistic outcome of the issue.

Despite the commitment made by all parties to the NPT for the abolition of nuclear weapons in the 2000 NPT Review Conference, the 2005 Review Conference collapsed due to the intransigence of the US government and the situation continues to be grim with that intransigence.

Nuclear weapons are against international law:

On July 8, 1996, the International Court of Justice delivered a unanimous opinion, which said there is no international customary nor international law that specifically sanctions the threat of use or use of nuclear weapons.

On July 10, 2007, the Peoples' Court on the Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki held in Hiroshima delivered its ruling.

The plaintiffs of the case were victims of the atomic bombings, people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and citizens who support the A-bomb victims. The defendants were the United States of America, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman and other 13 people, including the crew members, who were engaged in the actual dropping of the bombs on the two cities. The judges were Lenox Heins (Professor at Rutgers University, IADL representative to the United Nations, US), Ie Shoji (Professor at Himeji-Dokkyo University, Executive member of the Japan Association of Lawyers against Nuclear Arms) and Carlos Vargas (Professor at Costa Rica College of International Law).

The judges convicted the defendants for war crimes and crimes against humanity, on the ground of the ICJ's 1996 advisory opinion among others. They urged the US government to recognize the illegality of the bombings and apologize and provide compensation to the victims.

Position of the IADL: The International Association of Democratic Lawyers was founded at the French Supreme Court in Paris in 1946. Since then the association has worked for peace and democracy as an organization having consultative status with the UN Economic and Social Council. The IADL's present president is Jitendra Sharma from India.

The IADL also works for the abolition of nuclear weapons and has supported the World Conference against A & H Bombs since its start.

From the perspective of lawyers, the existence of nuclear weapons clearly violates international law, which needs to be constantly asserted by lawyers across the world. The illegality of nuclear weapons must be recognized in the form of an international treaty, for which lawyers are asked to play an important role.

Abolition of nuclear weapons is inextricably linked to world peace: Today, the main cause of war is the United States. The US government not only uses nuclear weapons as a deterrent but is ready to actually use them. It went to war in Afghanistan on the grounds of the 2001 9/11 terrorist attack in the United States. It invaded Iraq based on the lie of Iraqi's possession of weapons of mass destruction, and has been murderously attacking the people of Iraq. Also,

the Bush administration does not rule out the use of nuclear weapons; indeed it has used depleted uranium in war.

Furthermore, the administration is in pursuit of making nuclear weapons usable and promoting a missile defense system that would nullify nuclear missiles of countries it considers members of the "axis of evil."

The US war in Iraq is in a quagmire and we see no prospect for an end to it. I must emphasize that there is significant opposition to the war both in the US and internationally.

Role of Japan for the abolition of nuclear weapons: The utter destruction by the atomic bombings and the agony still suffered by the victims even after 6 decades is beyond our imagination. The Japanese government's continued failure to provide Hibakusha with sufficient relief measures is manifestly evident by the fact that a number of Hibakusha, organizing themselves in the Japan Confederation of A-and H-Bomb Sufferers Organizations (Hidankyo), are fighting the legal battle against the government for the recognition of their a-bomb related diseases.

On top of that, former Defense Minister, Kyuma Fumio's remark that the atomic bombing was inevitable makes one highly doubtful of the government's pretended anti-nuclear stance.

The government's immediate support to the US invasion of Iraq and the following dispatch of Japan's military forces there is yet more evidence of its subservience to the US government.

Abolition of nuclear weapons must be pursued not only by Hibakusha but also by all of us in Japan, and Article 9 is a major pillar of support for the promotion of the movements. The Abe Administration, however, is trying to revise the Constitution.

The petition campaign for the abolition of nuclear weapons promoted by Japan Gensuikyo and the movements calling on the government for a nuclear weapon free declaration are both important, to which the IADL gives its fullest support and cooperation.

IADL highly evaluates Article 9 for the place it holds in the world, and Japan Lawyers International Solidarity Association (JALISA), a member of IADL, supports the World Conference for Article 9 to be held in various parts of Japan, starting with the one in Makuhari, Chiba in May, 2008.

The abolition of nuclear weapons is the earnest desire of peoples across the globe. Let us work together to achieve this common goal. No more Hiroshimas, No more Nagasakis, No more Hibakusha.